00111643

THE

ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY

Town Hall, Bombay

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 19 September, 2016

THE

LITERATURE

OF

THE SABBATH QUESTION.

111643

BY

ROBERT COX, F.S.A. Scot.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:
MACLACHLAN AND STEWART;
AND SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO., LONDON.
MDCCCLXV.

1865

00111643

PRINTED BY NEILL AND COMPANY EDINBURGH.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

	PAGE
Cocceius, 1658,	1, 139
Heidanus, 1658,	5, 139, 447
Essenius, 1658,	5, 447
Amesius, 1658,	49
Fenner, 1658,	140
Tillam—Jennison, 1658,	447
Johnston—Ives—Brabourne—Stillingfleet, 1659,	6
Warren, 1659,	140
Ravanel, 1660,	139
Stennet, 1664,	10, 418
Durman, 1665,	10, 138
Essenius, 1666,	10
Hoornbeek, about 1666,	6, 138
Jeremy Taylor, about 1666,	10
John Wells, 1668,	13
Heylin, 1668,	18
Pearson, 1669,	17
Crawford, 1669,	18, 447
Lousden—Lightfoot, about 1670,	19
G. Hughes, 1670,	22
Owen, 1671,	22
Baxter, 1671,	28
Sellers, 1671,	35
Thomas Young (English translation), 1672,	38
F. Bampfield, 1672—Homes, 1673,	39
Cloadon—Case—Milton, 1674,	46
Brown of Wamphray, 1674-5,	448
Cave, 1675,	54
F. Bampfield—Cowell, 1677,	57
Robert Barclay, 1678,	70, 450
Alting, about 1678,	73, 139
Grantham, 1678,	447
Barrow, 1681,	63
Gregory—Waite, 1681,	73
Towerson, 1681,	73, 447, 453
Strauchius—Suicer, 1682,	74
The Patriarchal Sabbath, 1683,	74, 455
[illegible]ton, about 1684,	75
[illegible]an, 1685,	137, 459
[illegible]er, 1685,	77, 466
[illegible]yan, 1685,	80, 456
[illegible]an, 1686—Turretin, 1686—Allix, 1688,	81

PAGE
Fecht, 1688, ... 134
Hopkins, 1692, ... 82
Chafie, 1692 (originally published in 1652), ... 86, 458
T. Bampfield, 1692, ... 86, 200
Wallis, 1692, ... 87
Trosse, 1692, ... 447
T. Bampfield, 1693—Marlow, 1694, ... 91
Witsius, 1694, ... 92
Wallis, 1694, ... 99
Smith, 1694, ... 100
Pfeiffer, about 1696, ... 107
Vitringa, 1696, ... 107, 458
Le Clerc, 1696, 1703, ... 111
The New Testament Sabbath, 1696, ... 114
Grascome, 1700, ... 114
Keach, 1700, ... 115
Limborch, 1700, ... 119
Lünekogel, 1700, ... 110
Voightius, 1701, ... 74
Schwartz—Morer, 1701, ... 119
Woodward, 1703—Jurieu, 1704, ... 125
La Placette, 1704, ... 126
Howell, 1704, ... 127
Patrick, 1704, ... 132
Grant, 1705, ... 458
Abendana, 1706, ... 132
Hammersley, 1706, ... 134
Stryk, 1707, ... 134
Walch—Spener, about 1706, ... 136-7
Brunsman, 1707, ... 140
Defences of the Book of Sports, 1708-9, ... 141
Sharp, about 1710, ... 141
Bingham, 1708-22, ... 152
Addison, 1711, ... 155
Nelson—King, 1712, ... 156
Small, 1713, ... 159, 460
John Edwards—Bishop Burnet, 1713, ... 156
Sallier, 1715, ... 158
Willison, 1716, ... 158
Wroughton, 1716, ... 162
Beausobre and Lenfant, 1718, ... 162
Wotton—Fiddes, 1718, ... 163
Companion for the Lord's-day, 1721, ... 165
Marck, 1686, 1721, ... 165
Buddeus, 1723, ... 136
Carlow—Samuel Wright, 1724, ... 167
Samuel Clarke, about 1724, ... 169
Meyer—Outhovius—Syrbius, ... 172
Lewis, 1726—Samuel Wright, 1726, ... 172
Battely, 1724, ... 172, 460
Robert Hill, 1728, ... 172
Hallet, 1729-36, ... 174
Bedford, 1730—Calmet, 1730—Ridgley, 1731-3, ... 175
Ikenius, 1732, ... 176
Thomas Burnet, 1733, ... 176, 211
Jonathan Edwards, about 1733, ... 176
Cornthwaite, about 1733, ... 185

PAGE
Stackhouse, about 1735, ... 186
Cornthwaite—Fleming, 1736, ... 186, 187
Chubb, 1737, ... 187, 462
Wilkins, 1737—Watts, 1738, ... 187
Killingworth—Jephson, 1738, ... 191
Dobel, 1739, ... 464
Cornthwaite, 1740, ... 198
Stukely, 1742—Shuckford, 1743—James Foster, 1744, . . 202
Kennicott, 1747, ... 202
Bolton—Heberstreit, 1748, ... 206
Talbot, 1750—Webster, 1751—R. Parry, 1752—Moses Browne, 1753, ... 206
James Fisher, 1753, ... 464
Letter on Travelling on Sundays, 1757, ... 207
Steffe, 1757—Chandler, 1761, ... 207
John Taylor, about 1761, ... 208
Kennedy, 1762—Doddridge, 1763, ... 208
Lord Mansfield, 1764—Jennings, 1766—Amner, 1768, . . 210
Secker—Orton—Gill, 1769, ... 213
Michaelis, 1770-5, ... 214
Archibald Hall—Jortin, 1770, ... 229
Orr, 1772—De Coetlogon, 1776, ... 233
Carrington, 1776—De Courcy, 1777, ... 234
Act for preventing Abuses and Profanations on the Lord's-day, 1781 (21 Geo. III. c. 49), ... 234
Vicesimus Knox, about 1781, ... 239
Kennicott, 1781, ... 242
Glasse, 1781—Moffat, 1783—Animadversions on Profanation of the Sabbath, 1783—Porteus, 1784, ... 245
Symons, 1784—Brown of Haddington, 1785, ... 248
Paley, 1785, ... 248, 464
Adkin, 1785—Ogden, 1786, ... 268
Belknap, 1788—Anonymous, 1789, ... 269
Charlesworth, 1791—Wakefield, 1791, ... 269
Barbauld, 1792, ... 278
William Parry, 1792, ... 286
Priestley and Evanson, 1792, ... 291
Priestley, 1792, ... 315
James Wilson, 1792, ... 317
John Pope, 1792, ... 318
Wakefield, 1792—Bruckner, 1792, ... 319
Wakefield, 1792, ... 321
Decree of the National Convention of France, 1793, . . 321
Porteus, 1797, ... 323
Palmer, 1799—Horsley, about 1800, ... 325
Estlin, 1801—Joseph Hughes, 1804—West, 1805, . . . 329
Grahame—Cockin—Struthers—Gray, &c., 1805, &c., . . 329
Bolland, 1809—Gardener, 1809—Cooper, 1814, . . . 330
Leslie, 1815—Simpson, 1815—Wemyss, 1816, ... 330
S. Gilfillan, 1817—Tho. Scott, 1817—Glen, 1822, . . . 330
John Bentley, 1819, ... 367
Macbeth, 1822—Miss Mant, 1824—Holden, 1825, . . . 330
Anonymous, 1826—Lingard, 1826—Burgh, 1829—Geo. Miller, 1829, ... 331
Fidus, 1818—Geo. Cook, 1822—Higgins, 1826—Standish, 1826—T. S. Hughes, 1826, ... 332
Isaac D'Israeli, ... 332

PAGE
Dymond, 1829—Whately, 1828, 1830—Kaye, 1829, . . 333
The British Critic, 1829, 1830, ... 333
Religious Instruction Society of London, 1829, . . . 334
Herbert Smith, 1830—Samuel Lee, 1830, ... 334
Blomfield, 1830—Replies to Whately, ... 334
Daniel Wilson, 1830, ... 335
William James, 1830, 1833, ... 335-6
Richard Mant—J. J. Gurney—Conder, 1830, . . . 336
Forbes—Cameron—Burden, 1831, ... 336
Society for promoting the due Observance of the Lord's-day, 1831, ... 337
Sir Andrew Agnew's Committee of the House of Commons, 1832, ... 337
Bannerman—Wardlaw, 1832, ... 337-8
Macfarlan—Simeon—Presbyterian Review—W. Foster, 1832, 338
Barter, 1833—Sam. Lee, 1833—Noel, 1835, ... 339
Sir A. Agnew, 1835—W. C. Wilson, 1836—Stopford, 1837, . 339
Davies, 1838—Presbyterian Review—Ould—Chalmers, 1838, 340
Macfarlan, 1841—Robert Haldane, 1842—Bruce, 1842, . 340
C. Elizabeth, 1845—Lorimer, 1847—Bridges, 1847, . . 340
Mearns—Jordan, 1848, ... 340
Richard Winter Hamilton, 1848—And. Thomson, 1849, . 341
Prize Essays by Working Men—A Scotchman—Baylee—Merryweather, 1849, ... 341
M'Crie—Black—Noel—Wardlaw—Jordan—And. Thomson, 1850, ... 341
King—James Hamilton—M'Owan—Hannah—Innes—Glover—Hetherington—Reid—Symington—R. W. Hamilton—Bickersteth—Bates—J. A. James, 1850, ... 342
Greville, 1850—Kitto's Journal, 1851, ... 342
Jordan—Grandpierre—Plitt, 1851, ... 342
Baylee—Weir—Oliver—Woolwich Lectures, by Grainger and others, 1852, ... 343
The Sunday Steamer, 1853—Ball, 1853—Cochrane, 1854, . 343
Stewart—James Miller—Quarterly Review—M'Owan, 1854—Pirret, 1855, ... 343
Gowring—Arthur—Church of England Quarterly Review—British Quarterly Review, 1855, ... 345
Candlish—Mackenzie—Hugh M'Neile, 1856, ... 345
A London Employer—Henry Rogers—Heurtley, 1856, . 346
Journal of Sacred Literature—Micaiah Hill—Fairbairn, 1857, 346
Henderson—Wrixon—Irwin—Macnaughtan—O'Neill, 1859, 346
Exton, 1860, ... 346
North British Review, 1861—Tracts, ... 347
Fearon, 1833, ... 347-8
John Walker, 1833—Chirol, 1834—Marjoribanks, 1840—John Taylor, 1842—Bowman, 1842, ... 348
Larkin—W. Taylor—T. Perronet Thompson, 1842—Arnold, 1844, ... 349
Neale, 1845—Powell, in Kitto's Cyclopædia, 1845, . . 350
H. C. Wright, 1846—Pamphlet on Sunday Trains, 1847—Eadie, 1847, ... 351
Letter to Dr Candlish, 1847—Edinensis, 1847, . . . 352
Francis Russell, 1847, ... 354
Powell, Mearns, J. Von Gumpach, &c., in Kitto's Journal, 1848-9, ... 356
Sir W. Domville, 1849, ... 357

PAGE
Cranbrook, 1849—A Minister, 1850—W. H. Johnstone, 1850, 358
Westminster Review—Wauchope—Sundry pamphlets, 1850, 358
M'Kean, 1851, 359
J. B. Brown, 1853, 359, 397
Maurice—Cox, 1853, 360
Higginson, 1853, 360, 398
W. H. Johnstone, 1853—Sermons in Glass, 1854—Bishop Copleston, 1854, 363
Gordon—An Oxford M.A.—Domville, 1855, 363
Domville—Speeches in House of Commons—Clifford, 1856, 364
An Englishman's Letter to the Evangelicals, 1856, 364, 399
Ierson, 1856, 364, 401
Sunday the Rest from Labour, 1856, 366
Westminster Review—Answers to Arguments at Liverpool—Higginson, 1856, 367
Walter Farquhar Hook, 1856, 368
A London Clergyman—Fulton—Pickard—Time and Faith, 1856, 372
Henry Alford, 1856-61, 374
George Dawson, 1856, 375-6, 400
F. W. Robertson, 1856, 376
National Sunday League Record, 1856-9, 378
Leicester Prize Essays, and Reply, 1857, 378, 403
F. R. Young, 1856—Powell, 1857, 378
Langley, 1857—Parkinson, 1857—Slack, 1858—The Ten Commandments in the Church Service, 1859—Nayler, 1859, 379
A Clergyman of Twenty-five Years' Standing, 1859, 405
Reichel, 1859, 380
Tudor, 1860, 384
Cox, 1860—Hessey, 1860, 386
The Followers of Jesus—R. Hamilton, 393
The British Controversialist, 1853—Maguire and Langley, 1857—Langley and Court, 1858 —John Thomson and J. J. Lamb, 1858, 394
Samuel Brown, 1853—The Encyclopædia Britannica, 1859, 394
Powell, 1850—Macnair—Atkinson, 1850, 395
James Gilfillan, 1861, 395
Capes—Miss Sedgwick—Mrs H. Beecher Stowe—Griffith—Dublin Botanic Garden—George Combe, 407
Pamphlets on the Saturday Half-holiday, 1856-7, 408
Grapel, 1848—Stooks, 1853—Darling's Cyclop. Bibliogr., 409
John Brown Johnston, 1865, 434
Seventh-day Baptists: Edmonds, 1801—Alsop, 1801—Burnside, 1825—J. A. Begg, 1851—Article in Adam's Religious World Displayed—P. M'Farlane, 1860, 409-10
United States of America:—
Dwight, 1818—Wyman, 1816, 411
Agitation against Sunday mails, 412
Dewey, in Christian Examiner, 1829—American Quarterly Review, 1830—Pamphlet on Sunday Mails, 1830—Bishop W. White, 414
Heman Humphrey, 1829—Jenkins, 1830—North American Review, 1830—Princeton Review, 1831, 414
J. H. Agnew, 1832—Morton, 1833—H. Hooker, 1835—Waterbury, 1840—Worcester, 1840—Kingsbury, 1840—Peabody, 1840—Phelps, 1841—Convention at Rochester, N.Y., 1842, 415

PAGE

United States of America—*continued* :—
Lucy K. Wells, 1843—Conventions at Harrisburg, Saratoga, and Baltimore, 1844—Report of Committee on Canals, 1844—Stone, 1844—Coleman, 1844, 1852—Justin Edwards, 1844—Willard Hall, 1845—Weiser, 1845—Dabney—J. N. Brown and W. B. Taylor, 1853, 416
Stevens, 1857—Hodge—Smyth, 1862—Rice, Hogue, Ganse, Adams, and Vinton, 1862—Tracts, . . 417
Grew, 1838—W. L. Fisher, 1845—Anti-Sabbath Convention, 1848—Democratic Review, 1848—J. W. Browne, 1849—Whipple, 1849—Furness, 1850—Theodore Parker, 1852, ... 417
Seventh-day Baptists: Maxson—Parkinson—Chadwick—J. B. Brown—Davidson—Fahnestock—Morton—Seventh-day Baptist Memorial—Rupp—Gillett—Mrs Tamar Davis, &c., ... 418-19
Report of Committee of Legislature of New York on a petition against Sunday-laws, 1838, ... 419
Anti-Sabbath Convention at Boston, 1848, ... 423
Theodore Parker, ... 424
Lucretia Mott, ... 429-431
Parker Pillsbury—S. S. Foster, ... 430
William Adams, 1862, ... 431
American Sunday-laws, and prosecutions founded thereon, 433
Orville Dewey, 1829, ... 434
Harvey D. Ganse, 1862, ... 436
Nova Scotia: Lithgow—Brewster—Marshall—W. H. Humphrey—Gunnison, 1860, ... 437
Germany: Liebetrut—Augusti—Neander—Oehler, Winer—Bähr—Plitt—Franke—Mosheim, ... 438
Hengstenberg, ... 438, 439
France: Pérennès, 1845—Gaume, 1852—Mullois, 1855—Observateur du Dimanche, 1853—Proudhon, 1850—Newstead, 1837—Grandpierre, 1852—Salvador, 1828, . . . 441-2
Switzerland: Munier, 1851—Mellet, 1856, ... 443
Writers on the Modern Judaism: L. Alexander, 1814—Allen, 1816—D'Israeli, 1833—Mills, 1853—Kalisch, 1855—Philippsohn 1855—Anonymous, 1855—Jewish Chronicle, 1865, . 443

INDEX OF TEXTS, ... 465

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS, ... 471

THE

LITERATURE

OF

THE SABBATH QUESTION.

VOL. II.

141. COCCEIUS, JOHN, *Professor of Theology in the University of Leyden* (*died* 1669).—Indagatio Naturæ Sabbati et Quietis Novi Testamenti. Accedunt Veterum et Recentiorum Testimonia. Lugd. Bat. 1658. 12mo. Pp. 269.

This treatise is among the author's collected works, vol. ix. pp. 21-94; Amst. 1701, 12 vols. fol. In vol. vii. p. 119, there is a short article *De Festis et Sabbatho*.

The word *rest*, he thinks, comprehends within its meaning "the whole worship of God to be rendered under the New Testament; for faith and charity is the *rest* of the soul." (P. 3.) It will thus be seen that he agrees with the Fathers and Reformers in considering the Christian Sabbath as a rest, not from bodily labour on a weekly day, but from evil works on all days; and that tranquillity of soul by which it is accompanied, and of which, with its continuation in heaven, the ancient Sabbath is supposed to have been a type. (See above, i. 124, 135, 137.) With Grotius he holds, that, even if the seventh day was hallowed at the creation (a question determined by him in the negative), there is no proof that *rest* was enjoined as a part of the worship until the time of Moses, or that such an injunction was ever given to any but the Jews. The Jewish rest was in itself worship, "nam quod præceptum est, cultus est, si propter præceptum fiat," "for that is worship, which is done as in obedience to a Divine command." (P. 94;

see also 125, 144, 157.) But, besides that there is no record of the imposition upon Christians of the duty of resting on the Sabbath, it is plain from Paul's Epistles that he zealously withstood the Jewish converts who wished to bring their Gentile brethren under the law of Moses. "Undoubtedly the controversy about the Sabbath," adds Cocceius, "consists in the question,—Whether or not it be commanded to Christians, 'Thou shalt not do any work.'" (P. 144.) *That* cessation from work which is necessary to allow of attendance at religious meetings, he holds to be quite a different thing from the religious rest of the Jews. (P. 157.)*

He rejects all meanings of the phrase "moral law" except "natural law." (P. 136.)

The custom of assembling on the Lord's Day he regards as having arisen among the early Christians, "certè non sine providentiâ Dei," though without express command; and, *being* established, its observance, he thinks, cannot be opposed, or transferred to another day, without a tacit denial of the resurrection of our Lord. (P. 35.)

The titles of the different sections of the treatise will farther indicate the opinions of its author:—

"Novum Testamentum habet singularem quietem; quam Gentes debent agnoscere, et non violare. (P. 1.)

"Quies Novi Testamenti propria opponitur siti et jugo præcedentis temporis. (P. 3.)

"Decalogus postulat fidem promissionis et charitatem, cum amplexatione pignoris, nempe terræ Canaan. (P. 11.)

"Jugum Decalogo superadditum. Locus Ezech. xx. 25, 26. (P. 14.)

"Sanctificatio tollit jugum et sitim, et facit requiem. (P. 18.)

"Analogia requietis à siti et jugo cum quiete Sabbati probat Sabbatum esse typum; et sic præceptum de Sabbato observando obligat ad sanctificandum tempus requietis N. T. quippe quod est revera Sabbatum Domini. (P. 19.)

"Ratio Dominicæ observandæ. (P. 31.)

"Propositio quæstionis primæ: An Christianis incumbat præceptum cessandi septimâ? (P. 39.)

* This opinion is precisely that which, in the English controversy, was expressed by Prideaux and White, nay by the prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly, Dr Twisse (see above, i. 166, 171, 209); to whom, as we shall see, Owen and Baxter must be added. A learned Sabbatarian writer of the present time holds the singular notion that *even on the Jews* the Fourth Commandment imposed no farther duty of resting than this. "It is no part," says he, "of the Fourth Commandment, fairly interpreted, to prohibit ordinary labour, excepting in so far as it tends to interfere with the proper sanctification of the time to God. . . . It was not work in the abstract that was forbidden in the Fourth Commandment, but work only in so far as it interfered with the sanctified use of the day."—(*The Typology of Scripture, viewed in connection with the Entire Scheme of the Divine Dispensations*, by Patrick Fairbairn, D.D., Professor of Divinity, Free Church College, Glasgow; 3d ed., vol. ii. p. 136; Edin. 1857.)

"Primum argumentum, à naturâ, subjecto, et tempore præcepti cessationis. (P. 45.)

"Locus Es. xx. 10, 12. (P. 46.)

"Instantia, quòd *dedit* significet *restituit*. (P. 47.)

"Objectio I. Locus Genes. ii. 2, 3. (Pp. 48, 55.) Objectio II. Locus Exod. xx. 11. (P. 52.) Objectio III. (P. 56.) Objectio IV. Locus Hebr. iv. 3, 4. (P. 59.) Objectio V. (P. 62.)

"Argumentum secundum, ab eo, quòd Sabbatum est signum. (P. 62.)

"Exceptiones I., II., III., IV., V. (Pp. 63, 64, 65, 67, 69.)

"Amplior explicatio verborum, Exod. xx. 11. (P. 71.)

"Argumentum tertium; ab eo, quòd Sabbatum est onus. (P. 74.)

"Exceptio. (P. 78.)

"Argumentum quartum, à naturâ præceptorum Novi Testamenti. (P. 80.)

"Exceptiones I., II. (Pp. 89, 91.)

"Argumentum quintum, ab eo, quòd in prophetiis de N. T. Sabbatum non significat diem otii ab opere licito. (P. 93.)

"Propositio quæstionis secundæ: An Christianis incumbat præceptum directum, cessandi die aliquo ex septem. (P. 96.)

"Objectio ex loco Matth. xxiv. 20. (P. 102.)

"Locus Col. ii. 16, 17. (P. 107.) 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. (P. 115.) Rom. xiv. 5, 6. (P. 116.) Marc. ii. 27, 28. (P. 120.) Hebr. iv. 9. (P. 124.)

"Objectio Socinianismi. (P. 127.)

"Objectio mutationis Decalogi. (P. 131.)

"Quæstio de morali quarti præcepti. (P. 133.)

"Sensus Catechismi Belgici. (P. 139.)

"Synodus Dordracenæ. (P. 144.)*

"Objectio à distinctione præceptorum Decalogi. (P. 147.)

"Conclusio distinguens res minimè confundendas. (P. 156.)

From p. 161 to 269 is a copious collection of extracts from the Fathers, Reformers, and others, concerning the Sabbath and the Lord's Day—"Testimonia veterum et recentiorum ecclesiæ doctorum: ex quibus intelligi potest, quid Ecclesia primis temporibus et à reformatione de Sabbato, cessatione, et Dominicæ origine ac celebratione senserit." Some passages now known to be spurious are included. The writers quoted are Ignatius (p. 161, also 42);

* The Articles of the Synod of Dort, of which a translation borrowed from Dr Fairbairn was given above, i. 218, are cited by Cocceius in Latin. I observe that in the English version of Article 6, works of charity ought to have been joined to those of necessity, and that the recreations disapproved of would be more precisely described as those which are impediments to, than as those "discordant with," the worship of God. The article, as given by Cocceius, is as follows:—"6. Idem dies sic cultui divino est consecrandus, ut in eo cessetur ab omnibus quæ non sunt charitatis aut præsentis necessitatis, et ab ejusmodi recreationibus quæ Dei cultum impediunt."

Justin Martyr (p. 162);* Irenæus (p. 165); Dionysius of Corinth, and Clement of Alexandria (p. 169); Tertullian (p. 170); Cyprian, Novatian, and Lactantius (p. 176): the Council of Nice (p. 177); Eusebius, and Clement of Rome (p. 178); Juvencus (p. 189); Macarius (p. 190); Athanasius (p. 191; also 33, 41, 243); Hilary, and Cl. Marius Victor (p. 195); Cyril of Jerusalem (p. 196); Gregory Nazianzene (p. 196); Epiphanius (p. 197); Ambrose (p. 200); Gregory of Nyssa (p. 201); Basil, and Jerome (p. 203); Prudentius (p. 205); Chrysostom (p. 206); Augustine (p. 211; also 86); Paullinus (p. 221); Cyril of Alexandria (p. 222); Theodoret (p. 230); Sedulius (p. 231); Prosper (p. 232); Gennadius Massiliensis (p. 232); Isidorus Hispalensis (p. 233); Gregory the Great (p. 233); Luther (p. 252);† Melancthon, *Loci Communes*,

* The following is the most important passage in Justin Martyr, or indeed in any of the Fathers, relative to the Lord's Day. It was written between A.D. 139 and A.D. 150:—

"On the day which is called Sunday, there is an assembly in one place of all who dwell either in towns or in the country; and the Memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the Prophets are read, as long as the time permits. Then, when the reador hath ceased, the President delivers a discourse, in which he reminds and exhorts them to the imitation of all these good things. We then all stand up together, and put forth prayers. Then, as we have already said, when we cease from prayer, bread is brought, and wine, and water; and the President in like manner offers up prayers and praises with his utmost power; and the people express their assent by saying, Amen. The consecrated elements are then distributed and received by every one; and a portion is sent by the deacons to those who are absent.

"Each of those also who have abundance, and are willing, according to his choice, gives what he thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the President, who succours the fatherless and the widows, and those who are in necessity from disease or any other cause; those also who are in bonds, and the strangers who are sojourning among us; and in a word takes care of all who are in need.

"We all of us assemble together on Sunday, because it is the first day in which God changed darkness and matter, and made the world. On the same day also Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead. For he was crucified the day before that of Saturn; and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the Sun, he appeared to his apostles and disciples and taught them what we now submit to your consideration." (*Apology for the Christians to Antoninus Pius*, §§ 87-89; Chevallier's transl. pp. 224-5.)

This is the passage referred to above, i. 106. For discussions on it see the works mentioned i. 120, especially Domville, i. 273, 294, 304, 310. Three things chiefly have been insisted on: 1. That the day is called by Justin, not the Lord's Day, but Sunday; 2. That it is not called the Sabbath, or in any way described as a day of rest from work—though such cessation, while the meetings were held, and for the purpose of attending them, is of course implied; and 3. That among the reasons assigned for assembling on it, there is neither the command nor the example of Christ or his apostles, nor the obligation of a primeval or the Mosaic Sabbath-law.

† The passage quoted above, i. 126-7, is here given by Coccoius in the original German.

(p. 259); Christophorus Pezelius, *Arg. et Resp. Theol.*, p. 3, p. 169 (p. 260); Calvin, *Catechismus Ecclesiæ Genevensis* (p. 261; also 96); Catechesis Heidelbergensis (p. 262; also 134); Ursinus (p. 262); the later Swiss Confession, c. 24 (p. 43); Belgian Catechism (p. 139); Synod of Dort (p. 263; also 144, 269); Spiliardus (p. 264), &c. Those passages from the Fathers which were written in Greek have Latin translations subjoined to them. At the end of the collection Cocceius presents (pp. 235–252) a "synopsis of those things which are to be remarked in the testimonies of these ancient writers;" some of which things are as follows:—

"1. None of them affirms that a commandment to rest on the seventh day was given to Adam in his unfallen state.

"2. Or that Adam, or any of the patriarchs before Moses, sabbatized or rested from labour on a stated day, as in obedience to a precept.

"3. Some writers of pretty high antiquity affirm, that Adam, Enoch, Noah, Melchisedec, and Abraham, did not sabbatize, but exercised a free kind of piety. . . . .

"12. None of them is of opinion that God by the Fourth Commandment has determined a time for his worship.

"13. Only Chrysostom takes notice, that Moses, in the history of the creation, has insinuated that it would be a good thing for the Church in common and universally to devote at least a seventh day to solemn assemblies of all the members of the Church in every place. . . . .

"15. And it is to be well observed, that they considered the precept of resting from labour to relate to the seventh day only, which alone they designated *the Sabbath;* never calling the Sabbath *the Lord's Day*, but carefully distinguishing between the Lord's Day and the Sabbath. . . . .

"23. The ancient Christians called the first day of the week the Lord's Day, thereby commemorating that day on which Christ had arisen from the dead. . . . . And,

"24. None of the ancients affirms, that this appellation was given to the Sunday because Christ had enjoined such rest from work thereon as formerly the Jews observed on the Sabbath."

142. HEIDANUS, ABRAHAM, *Professor of Theology at Leyden* (*died* 1678).—De Sabbato et Die Dominico Disputatio. Accedit Joh. Prideaux Tractatus de Sabbato. Lugd. Bat. 1658. 8vo.—De Sabbato Disputatio Secunda. Lugd. Bat. 1658. 8vo.

143. ESSENIUS, ANDREW, *Professor of Theology at Utrecht* (*died* 1672).—Dissertatio de Perpetuâ Moralitate Decalogi, adeoque specialiùs etiam Sabbathi, ex

Disputationibus ipsius de Fœdere Legali desumpta et recognita. Ultraj. 1658. 12mo.

See also below, No. 150.

The last three articles shew the revival of the Dutch controversy, referred to by Hengstenberg in a passage quoted above, i. 218. Concerning this revival, he proceeds to say: "The principal opponents of the validity of the Mosaic law in this new period of the controversy, which commenced in the year 1658, were Heidanus and Cocceius in Leyden; the chief writers on the other side, Hoornbeek in Leyden,* and Essen in Utrecht. A long series of works appeared on both sides in Dutch and Latin, of which those of Cocceius were the most important, whose opponents went so far as to accuse him of Socinianism, on account of his views. At last the States-General were obliged to interfere. The controversy was stopped by them at Leyden by the edict issued by them on the 7th August 1659, prohibiting any more writing upon the subject, and commanding that the six articles of the Dort Commission should be regarded as final. But it continued at Utrecht with the greater warmth. There Francis Burman appeared as the opponent of the Jewish observance of the Sabbath; and was warmly opposed by his less known colleagues. In Groningen, too, these contests were carried on; Alting defending against Maresius the universal validity of the Mosaic Sabbath law. The controversy was kept up in Holland till the eighteenth century, but with greater calmness. However, the more liberal views gradually advanced, and became more and more prevalent throughout the Reformed Churches, with the exception of Great Britain." (P. 70.)

144. JOHNSTON, NATHANAEL, M.D.—Sententia Sociniana de Sabbato inimica Pietati. 1659. 4to.

145. IVES, JEREMY.—Saturday no Sabbath Day. Lond. 1659. 4to.

146. BRABOURNE, THEOPHILUS (*see* No. 80).—An Answer to two Books on the Sabbath: the one by Mr Ives, entitled, Saturday no Sabbath Day; the other by Mr Warren, The Jews' Sabbath Antiquated. Lond. 1659. 8vo.

147. STILLINGFLEET, EDWARD, *Bishop of Worcester* (*died* 1699).—Irenicum; A Weapon-salve for the

* I have not discovered the title of any separate work by Hoornbeek; but his arguments are probably to be found in one or other of his *Theologia Practica* (Ultraj. 1689; 2 vols. 4to), and *Institutiones Theologicæ*. He was professor of divinity at Leyden, and died in 1666.

Church's Wounds: Or the Divine Right of Particular Forms of Church Government, discussed and examined according to the Principles of the Law of Nature, the Positive Laws of God, the Practice of the Apostles and the Primitive Church, and the Judgment of Reformed Divines. Lond. 1659.

This celebrated treatise will be found in the author's collected *Works*, vol. ii. (Lond. 1709, fol.)

In Part I. ch. i., he observes that "whatsoever binds Christians as an universal standing law, must be clearly revealed as such, and laid down in Scripture in such evident terms, as all who have their senses exercised therein may discern it to have been the will of Christ that it should perpetually oblige all believers to the world's end, as is clear in the case of baptism, and the Lord's Supper. But here," says he, "I shall add one thing by way of caution; that there is not the same necessity for a particular and clear revelation in the *alteration* of a *law unrepealed* in some circumstances of it, as there is for the establishing of a *new law*. As to the former, viz., the change of a standing law as to some particular circumstance, a different practice by persons guided by an infallible spirit is sufficient; which is the case as to the observation of the Lord's Day under the Gospel: For the Fourth Command standing in force as to the morality of it, a different practice by the Apostles may be sufficient for the particular determination of the more ritual and occasional part of it, which was the limitation of the observation of it to that certain day." (*Works*, ii. 162.) Again: "Nature dictates that God should be worshipped; the law informs what day and time to spend in his worship; grace must enable us to perform that worship on that day in a right manner. And because the same reason for God's worship continues still, therefore it is a precept of the natural law that God should be worshipped. What time precisely must be spent in God's worship (as one day in seven), though the reason be evident to the nature of it when it is made known, yet it is hard to conceive that nature could have found out the precise determination of the time. Although I must confess the general consent of nations as to the seventh part (if it were fully cleared), would speak fair to be the voice of nature, or at least a tradition received from the sons of Noah, which, if so, will be an evidence of the observation of the Sabbath before the children of Israel's being in the wilderness. But granting that the seventh part of time was a positive law of God, yet I say it binds immutably, because there is as strong a reason for it now as ever, and *ratio immutabilis præcepti facit præceptum immutabile*. This I take to be the sense of those who distinguish between *morale positivum* and *morale naturale*, *i.e.* that some things are so moral, that even nature itself can discover them,—as that God should be worshipped. Other things are so

moral, that though the reason of them be founded in nature, yet there wants divine revelation to discover them to us; but when once discovered, are discerned to be very agreeable to common principles of reason: And these when once discovered, are as immutably obligatory as the other, because the reason of them is immutable. And of this nature is the determination of the particular time for God's worship, and limitation of it to one day in seven. But what was in that precept merely occasional, as the first and original ground of its limitation to the seventh in order, God's resting on that day from the work of creation (Gen. ii. 2), and the further ground of its inforcement to the Jews, viz., their deliverance out of Egypt (Deut. v. 15); these being not immutable but temporary and occasional, may, upon as great ground given, and approved of God for that end (as is evident by the Apostles' practice), be sufficient reason of the alteration of the seventh day to the first day of the week. By this may briefly be seen how irrationally those speak, who say we have no farther ground for our observation of the Lord's Day now, than for other arbitrary festivals of the Church, viz., the tradition of the Church of God. I grant, the tradition of the Church doth acquaint us with Apostolical practice; but the ground of our observation of the Lord's Day is not the Church's tradition, but that Apostolical practice conveyed by universal tradition (which, setting aside the festivals observed upon the Lord's Day, can very hardly be found for any other). But supposing universal tradition for other festivals, I say here tradition is not only used as a testimony and instrument of conveyance, as in the other case of the Lord's Day; but is itself the only argument, and the very ground of the original observation: between which two what a wide difference there is, let any rational man judge. (Pp. 166, 167.)

In Part I. ch. v., he argues that the dictates of nature require not only the giving of worship to God, but "the circumstantiating of time and place, and the dedication of both to the end of worship. That these are very consonant to natural reason appears by the universal consent of all nations agreeing in any form of worship of a Deity; who have all had their set times and fixed places to perform this worship in. I shall not insist, as some have done, that the seventh day hath been particularly and solemnly observed for the worship of God by the consent of nations; although there be many probable arguments and plausible testimonies brought for a peculiarity of honour to, if not service on, the seventh day, out of Josephus, Aristobulus Judæus (and by him from Linus, Hesiod, Homer), Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Lampridius, Seneca, Tibullus, and many others; (Joseph. *c. Ap.*, l. 2; Euseb. *Præp.*, l. 13, cap. 12; Tertull. *Apol.*, c. 16, *c. Notion.*, l. 1, c. 13; Lamprid. *Vit. Alex. Sever.*; Seneca, *Ep.* 95; Tibullus, *Eleg.* 3, l. 1; Lucian, *Pseudol.*, p. 893, ed. Paris.) From which testimonies it appears that some kind of reverence and honour was given to the seventh day; but whether that day was the seventh of the week, or the seventh of the month (which was consecrated among the Greeks to

Apollo, upon which the Θαργήλια and Πυανέψια. and the seventh of every month were observed in honour of him); whether the title of ἱερὸν ἦμαρ did belong to the seventh or one of the ἱερτάσιμοι or ἀποφραδὶς, *festival* or *inauspicious* days (for it was common to both); whether observed by any public religious custom, or by some private superstition—are things too large to inquire into, too difficult now to determine, and not necessary for my present purpose; it being sufficient in order to that, if they had any set times at all for worship, which shews how solemn the worship of God ought to be. And this is not denied by any; it being so necessary a consectary from the duty of worship that there must be a time for performance of it; and not only in general that there must be some time, but a sufficient proportion of time to be consecrated to the public exercise of piety, both from the consideration of man's obligation to divine service from his nature, from the weight and concernment of the things that time is employed in, and in the inward sense of immortality upon the soul of man. But then what this proportion of time must exactly be, I see not how mere natural light could determine it, but it would rather suggest it to be highly reasonable to wait for and expect such a determination from the Supreme Rector and Governor of the world; it being far more fit for the master to prescribe unto the servant what proportion of service he expects from him, than that the servant should both divide and choose his own time, and the proportion of service which he owes to his master. . . . But when God hath thus determined it, nature cannot but assent to that particular determination, that in consideration of the works of God, it is most reasonable that rather one day in a week than one in a month should be dedicated to God's service; that the seventh day of the week, upon God's resting on that day and sanctifying it, should be the precise day, unless some reason equivalent to that of the first institution, and approved by God for that end, be the ground of its alteration to another of the seven, which is the reason of the change under the Gospel." (Pp. 215, 216).

In vol. iii. p. 661, he treats of *The Particular Duties of the Parochial Clergy*, at a visitation, Oct. 27, 1696. A great deal of evidence is there adduced to shew that the Lord's Day had been "set apart for the solemn worship and service of God, especially by the clergy, from the first settlement of a parochial clergy in this Church," (pp. 662-666); his purpose probably being to arm his clergy against the Seventh-Day Baptists or "Sabbatarians." For he adds:—"These things I have the more largely insisted upon, to shew that the religious observation of the Lord's Day is no novelty started by some late sects and parties among us, but that it hath been the general sense of the best part of the Christian world, and is particularly inforced upon us of the Church of England, not only by the Homilies, but by the most ancient ecclesiastical law among us." He takes notice by the way, that "Bede distinguishes between the patriarchal and Jewish Sabbath: the latter he calls a 'carnal,' and the other a 'spiritual Sabbath;' the Jewish lay in a

strict abstinence from labour, but the other in prayer, and devotion, and spiritual contemplations." (P. 664).*

148. STENNET, EDWARD (*see* No. 138).—The Seventh Day is the Sabbath of the Lord; in answer to Mr Russel's book, No Seventh-Day Sabbath recommended by Jesus Christ. 1664. 4to.

149. BURMAN, FRANCIS, *Professor of Theology at Utrecht* (*died* 1679).—De Moralitate Sabbati. Ultraj. 1665.

See above, No. 143.

150. ESSENIUS, ANDREW (*see* No. 143).—Disquisitio de Moralitate Sabbati Hebdomadalis. 1665.—Dissertationes de Decalogo et die Sabbathi, adversus Abrahamum Heidanum. Ultraj. 1666.—Vindiciæ Quarti Præcepti in Decalogo, seu Lege Divinâ Morali, adversus Fr. Burmannum. Ultraj. 1666. 8vo.

151. TAYLOR, JEREMY, *Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore* (*died* 1667).—Whole Works; with a Life of the Author, and a Critical Examination of his Writings, by the Right Rev. Reginald Heber, D.D., Lord Bishop of Calcutta. Lond. 1822. 15 vols. 8vo.

There are several subsequent editions; including one in 3 vols. imperial 8vo, Lond. 1839. All these have a copious index, in which see the articles DECALOGUE, LORD'S DAY, and SABBATH.

Bishop Taylor is characterized by Dr Parr as a man "fraught with guileless ardour, with peerless eloquence, and with the richest stores of knowledge, historical, classical, scholastic, and theological." (*Letter to Milner*, in Parr's *Works*, iii. 428.)

He treats of the Lord's Day in *The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living*, chap. iv., sect. 6, entitled, "Of keeping Festivals, and Days holy to the Lord, particularly the Lord's Day" (vol. iv. pp. 212–217); in the *Ductor Dubitantium*, b. ii., ch. 2, rule 6, §§ 43–62 (vol. xii. pp. 412–430); and in the *Life of Jesus*, Part II., Sect. 12, Disc. x., §§ 24, 25 (vol. iii. pp. 28–30.) Referring especially to the first of these works, which has been often reprinted, for a full statement of his views, I shall quote from all the three some passages bearing mainly on controverted points:—

The Sabbath contrasted with the Lord's Day.—"We are eternally bound to confess God Almighty to be the maker of heaven and

* See above, vol. i. p. 220.

earth; but the manner of confessing it is changed from a rest, or a doing nothing, to a speaking something; from a day to a symbol; from a ceremony to a substance; from a Jewish rite to a Christian duty; we profess it in our creed, we confess it in our lives; we describe it by every line of our life, by every action of duty, by faith, and trust, and obedience: and we do also, upon great reason, comply with the Jewish manner of confessing the creation, so far as it is instrumental to a real duty. We keep one day in seven, and so confess the manner and circumstance of the creation; and we rest also, that we may tend holy duties; so imitating God's rest better than the Jew in Synesius, who lay upon his face from evening to evening, and could not, by stripes or wounds, be raised up to steer the ship in a great storm. God's rest was not a natural cessation; he, who could not labour, could not be said to rest: but God's rest is to be understood to be a beholding and rejoicing in his work finished; and therefore we truly represent God's rest when we confess and rejoice in God's works and God's glory.

"This the Christian Church does upon every day, but especially upon the Lord's Day, which she hath set apart for this and all other offices of religion, being determined to this day by the resurrection of her dearest Lord, it being the first day of joy the Church ever had. And now, upon the Lord's Day, we are not tied to the rest of the Sabbath, but to all the work of the Sabbath; and we are to abstain from bodily labour, not because it is a direct duty to us, as it was to the Jews, but because it is necessary in order to our duty that we attend to the offices of religion.

"The observation of the Lord's Day differs nothing from the observation of the Sabbath in the matter of religion, but in the manner. They differ in the ceremony and external rite: rest with them was the principal; with us it is the accessory. They differ in the office or forms of worship; for they were then to worship God as a Creator and a gentle Father; we are to add to that our Redeemer, and all his other excellencies and mercies. And, though we have more natural and proper reason to keep the Lord's Day than the Sabbath, yet the Jews had a Divine commandment for their day, which we have not for ours; but we have many commandments to do all that honour to God, which was intended in the Fourth Commandment; and the apostles appointed the first day of the week for doing it in solemn assemblies." (*Holy Living*, loc. cit.)

The Sabbath not moral.—"All holidays are days designed for holy offices, for the celebration of the Divine name and the Divine attributes; for charitable and holy discourses. That rest which God superadded, being only commemorative of their deliverance from the Egyptian servitude, was not moral, nor perpetual; it could be dispensed with at the command of a prophet; it was dispensed with at the command of Joshua,—it was broken at the siege of Jericho,—it always yielded when it clashed with the duty of any other commandment; it was not observed by the priests in

the Temple, nor in the stalls by the herdsman, nor in the house by the 'major-domo;' but they did lead the ox to water, and circumcised a son; that is, it yielded to charity, and to religion, not only to a moral duty, but to a ceremonial, and therefore could not oblige us. But that which remained was imitable; the natural religion which was used upon the Jewish festivals was fit also for the holidays of Christians." (*Ductor Dubitantium*, loc. cit. § 58.)

"The strong, violent, and firm persuasions of conscience in single persons, or in some communities of men, is not a sufficient indication of a moral law. The weak brother, of whom St Paul speaks, durst not eat flesh, but thought it an impiety next to unpardonable, but he was abused: and there are at this day some persons, some thousands of persons, against whose conscience it is to dress meat upon the Lord's Day, or to use an innocent permitted recreation. Now, when such an opinion makes a sect, and this sect gets firm confidents and zealous defenders, in a little time it will dwell upon the conscience, as if it were a native there; whereas it is but a pitiful inmate, and ought to be turned out of doors." (*Ibid.* § 73.)

The Lord's Day not substituted for the Sabbath.—"The primitive Church kept both the Sabbath and the Lord's Day till the time of the Laodicean Council, about three hundred years after Christ's nativity, and almost in every thing made them equal; and, therefore, did not esteem the Lord's Day to be substituted in the place of the obliterated Sabbath, but a feast celebrated by great reason and perpetual consent, without precept or necessary Divine injunction. But the liberty of the Church was great: they found themselves disobliged from that strict and necessary rest which was one great part of the Sabbatic rites; only they were glad of the occasion to meet often for offices of religion, and the day served well for the gaining and facilitating the conversion of the Jews, and for the honourable sepulture of the synagogue, it being kept so long, like the forty days' mourning of Israel for the death of their father Jacob." (*Life of Jesus*, loc. cit.)

"The Jewish Sabbath being abrogated, the Christian liberty, like the sun after the dispersion of the clouds, appeared in its full splendour: and then the division of days ceased, and one day was not more holy than another, as St Paul disputes in his Epistle to the Galatians (Gal. iv. 10), and from him St Jerome (*in hunc locum*); and when St Paul reproved the Corinthians for going to law before the unbelievers, who kept their court-days upon the first day of the week, he would not have omitted to reprove them by so great and weighty a circumstance as the profaning the Lord's Day, in case it had been then a holy day, either of Divine or apostolical institution: for when, afterwards, it grew into an ecclesiastical law, and either by law or custom was observed together with the Jewish Sabbath, Constantine (*apud Euseb.*) made a favourable edict that the Christians should not be impleaded on those two festivals. Of which I only make use to this purpose, that

among the Gentiles these were law-days; and therefore the Corinthians must needs have been profaners of that day by their lawsuits, and therefore have been, upon that account, obnoxious to the apostolical rod, if the day had then, in any sense of authority, been esteemed holy." (*Ductor Dubitantium*, loc. cit. § 54.)

Refreshment of Labourers.—"Those who labour hard in the week, must be eased upon the Lord's Day; such ease being a great charity and alms: but, at no hand, must they be permitted to use any unlawful games, anything forbidden by the laws, anything that is scandalous, or anything that is dangerous and apt to mingle sin with it; no games prompting to wantonness, to drunkenness, to quarrelling, to ridiculous and superstitious customs; but let their refreshments be innocent, and charitable, and of good report, and not exclusive of the duties of religion." (*Holy Living*, loc. cit.)

Permitted Works and Recreations.—"The question concerning particular works, or permitted recreations, is wholly useless and trifling; for 'quod lege prohibitoriâ vetitum non est, permissum intelligitur,' says the law; 'all that is permitted, which in the negative precept is not forbidden.' But as for some persons to give themselves great liberties of sport on that day, is neither pious nor prudent; so to deny some to others is neither just nor charitable. The ploughman sits still in the church, and the priest labours; and the wearied man is permitted to his refreshments, and others not permitted, because they need it not; and there is no violation of any commandment of God, even when there is a profanation of the day indulged upon pious and worthy considerations." (*Ductor Dubitantium*, loc. cit. § 61.)

152. WELLS, JOHN, *an English Nonconformist minister* (*died* 1696).—The Practical Sabbatarian: or, Sabbath-Holiness crowned with superlative Happiness. Lond. 1668. 4to. Pp. 787.

This huge volume is the most tedious of all the Puritan productions about the Sabbath. There is not a spark of originality to animate the lump; and but for the chapter exhibiting "God's tremendous judgments executed upon those who have profaned and violated his holy day," its dulness would be without relief.

Looking at the multiplicity of the Sabbath duties here and often elsewhere represented as incumbent on Christians, we can hardly wonder at Dow's appeal to the Puritans,—"whether ever they, or any other, did yet, or could possibly keep the Lord's Day in that strict manner as they urge it." (See above, i. 184.) It has even been questioned whether a single example of Sabbath-observance of the kind prescribed by Wells can be found in Scripture; and the doubters have gone so far as to maintain that if the stricter Puritans are in the right, our Lord himself, who acted inconsistently

with their rules when he walked in the fields and attended a feast on the Sabbath-day, must unquestionably be regarded as a Sabbath-breaker.

The work begins as a discourse on Isa. lviii. 13, 14, of which text the 1st, 2d, 7th, 8th, and 9th chapters are an explanation. In Chapter 3, the utter unlawfulness of secular and servile works on the Sabbath is maintained; and in Chapter 4 it is argued that "needless recreations" are equally unlawful. The remaining chapters are entitled thus:—"5. The whole Sabbath is to be spent with God.—6. Impertinent and frothy language unbecoming and defiling the Sabbath.—10. There must be serious preparation before the solemn day of the Sabbath.—11. What those preparatory duties are.—12. It is most advised and necessary to rise early on God's holy day.—13. How we must spend the morning of a Sabbath.—15-22. What we must meditate upon, on the morning of the Lord's Day.—23. We must not only meditate on the God of the Sabbath, but on the Sabbath of God, in the morning of his holy day.—24. A collation and comparison of the Jewish with the Christian Sabbath.—25. The comparison of the Christian's Sabbath here with his eternal Sabbatism or rest above.—26. Not only meditation, but prayer, with other services, must fill up the morning of the Sabbath.—27. How we must demean ourselves in the public assembly on the holy Sabbath.—18. Sleeping in ordinances is a great and daring provocation.—29. Other evils to be avoided in our outward behaviour when we come to the public assembly.—30. How to compose our inward man in our approaches to God in ordinances.—31. As we must be strict in our behaviour, so we must be spiritual in our duties, when we approach the public ordinances.—32. Active graces do well become holy ordinances.—33. How we must improve the interval between the morning and the evening worship in the public assembly.—34. How we must spend the evening of the Sabbath when the public assemblies are dismissed.—35. Singing of psalms is the music of a Sabbath.—36, 37. Some supplemental directions for the better observation of the Lord's Day.—38. Some necessary cautions for the preventing of Sabbath-pollution.—39. The Lord's Day is a day of rest, but not of idleness.—40. Some incident cases proposed, to satisfy consoience in Sabbath-observation.—31. A charge drawn up against profane persons, who live down the Sabbath by loose and vicious practices.—42. An expostulation with enthusiastic persons, who cry down the Sabbath, under the specious pretence that every day is a Christian Sabbath.—43. There was a time when the Jews were exemplarily strict in Sabbath-observation.—44. Holiness doth as well become the Christian as the Jewish Sabbath, if we look back to the infancy of the world.—45. Sabbath-holiness doth as well become the Christian as the Jew, if we look back to the infancy of the Law.—46. The sanctification of the Sabbath is the Christian's homage as well as the Jew's, if we look back to the infancy of the Gospel.—47. A plea with Christians to outvie the Jews in Sabbath-holiness and observations.—48. The first decade

of arguments to persuade conscience to an holy observation of the Lord's Day.—49. God's tremendous judgments, &c.—50. Some remarkables relating to the dreadful fire of London, which began on the Lord's Day, Sept. 2, 1666.—51. A second decade of arguments to reinforce the same persuasion that we would keep holy the Lord's Day.—52. A third decade of arguments, &c.—53. The resurrection of Christ is not only a real ground for the institution, but a cogent argument for the holy observation of the Lord's Day.—54. Some miscellaneous prescriptions for the better discharge of our duty towards the Lord's Day.—55. England bewailed for its great and general profanation of God's holy Sabbath."

The author argues that "to say we cannot keep a whole Sabbath to the Lord, is an imputation cast upon Divine wisdom. God never commands impossibilities, and yet he severely commands the *full* observation of a *whole* Sabbath: and yet to say, God is an hard master, deserves the brand of an unprofitable servant." "It is very sad when the Sabbath is looked on as our burden, and not our privilege, and our attendance upon ordinances our task, and not our triumph—our bondage, and not our blessedness." (Pp. 461, 407.) But supposing the Sabbath to be a Christian institution, the fact that few, if any, feel themselves capable of spending it without weariness in the manner proposed, may reasonably suggest, not indeed that God is a hard master, but that his commands in this respect have perhaps been misunderstood.

It is probable that Wells, more than any other, was in Dr Owen's eye when he wrote the following passage in the sixth of his *Exercitations concerning the Day of Sacred Rest*:—"And yet I will not deny but that there have been and are mistakes in this matter, leaning towards the other extreme [of overloading the Christian with Sabbath duties]. Directions have been given, and that not by a few, for the observation of a day of holy rest, which either for the matter of them or the manner prescribed, have had no sufficient warrant or foundation in the Scripture. For whereas some have made no distinction between the Sabbath as moral and as Mosaical, unless it be merely in the change of the day, they have endeavoured to introduce the whole practice required on the latter into the Lord's Day. But we have already shewn that there were sundry additions made unto the command, as to the manner of its observance, in its accommodation unto the Mosaical pedagogy, besides that the whole required a frame of spirit suited thereunto. Others again have collected whatever they could think of that is good, pious, and useful in the practice of religion, and prescribed it all in a multitude of instances, as necessary to the sanctification of this day; so that a man can scarcely in six days read over all the duties that are proposed to be observed on the seventh. And it hath been also no small mistake, that men have laboured more to multiply directions about external duties, giving them out as it were by number or tale, than to direct the mind or inward man, in and unto a due performance of the whole duty of the sanctification of the day, according to the spirit and genius of gospel obedience. And

lastly, it cannot be denied but that some, it may be measuring others by themselves, and their own abilities, have been apt to tie men up unto such long tiresome duties, and rigid abstinences from refreshments, as have clogged their minds, and turned the whole service of the day into a wearisome bodily exercise that profiteth little. . . . Upon the whole matter, I am inclinable to judge, and do so, that the observation of the day is to be commensurate unto the use of our natural strength, on any other day, from morning to night."—(§§ 6, 8.) This is likewise Baxter's view (see below, p. 32), as it is that of Horsley (Sermon 23; quoted by Cox, p. 120), and of Owen's biographer Mr Orme (*Life of Owen*, p. 269).

Although Mr Wells professes to treat only of the practical part of the subject, he sometimes lapses into the controversial—as in chap. 42, where the texts Rom. xiv. 6, Col. ii. 16, 17, and Gal. iv. 10, are discussed. He omits, however, to quote the *fifth* verse of Rom. xiv., "One man esteemeth one day above another; *another esteemeth every day alike:* let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." By some this may be thought a serious omission—yet it is by no means peculiar to Mr Wells; for many other advocates of Sabbatarianism have either ignored the whole passage, or, when quoting or referring to it, made no attempt to prove their assumption that "every day" means six days of the week instead of seven. They have thus brought themselves under the suspicion, well or ill founded, that they *durst not* encounter the words of St Paul. (See *Cox*, pp. 56-60, 291, 326, 516, 517.)

A few of the instances of "God's tremendous judgments" are here selected:—

"One Richard Bourn, servant to Gaspar Birch of Ely, was so accustomed to travel on the Lord's Day that he made no conscience of it, seldom or never coming to the public congregation to hear God's word on that day, but went to St Ives market, where he stayed and spent the day; where being drunk, he was overtaken by Divine justice, for, coming home fraught with commodities, he fell into the river and was drowned. And thus as his sins did meet to provoke the Lord, viz., his drunkenness and Sabbath-breaking, so the stream did meet to destroy and overthrow him. . . .

"In Helvetia, near Belessina, three men were playing at dice on the Lord's Day, and, in their play, one called Utrick Schrætorus, having hopes of a good cast, having lost much money before, he now expected fortune, or rather the devil to succour him, and therefore he breaks out into this horrid blasphemy, 'If fortune deceive me now, I will thrust my dagger into the body of God as far as I can;' and so with a powerful force he throws it up towards heaven, which dagger was never seen more, and immediately five drops of blood fall before them all upon the table, and as suddenly came the devil among them, and carries away this vile wretch, with such a terrible and hideous noise as the whole city was astonished at it. Those who remained endeavoured to wipe off the blood, but to little purpose, for the more they rubbed the more perspicuous and visible the blood was. Report carries it over the

city, multitudes flock to see this wonder, who find those who had thus profaned the Sabbath rubbing the blood to get it out. 'These two men, who were companions to him who was carried away by the devil, were by the decree of the senate bound in chains, and, as they were leading to prison, one of them was suddenly struck dead, and from his whole body a wonderful number of worms and vermin was seen to crawl. The city thus terrified with God's judgments, and to the intent that God might be glorified, and a future vengeance averted from the place, they caused the third offender, one of the gaming companions, to be forthwith put to death; and they caused the table, with the drops of blood upon it, to be preserved as a monument of God's wrath against this sin. Thus this blasted table, like Lot's wife, was a standing warning piece, to cause all to take heed of Sabbath-breaking and ingratitude. . . .

"A vintner, who was a great swearer and drunkard, as he was standing at his door upon the Lord's Day, with a pot of wine in his hand to invite his guests, was, by the wonderful justice and power of God, carried into the air with a whirlwind, and never seen or heard of more. How soon can the word of God make the creature, and how suddenly can the wind of God destroy the sinner! Let us read and tremble. . . .

"At Tidworth, on the Lord's Day, many were met in the churchyard to play at foot-ball, where one of this wicked company had his leg broken, which, by a secret judgment of the Lord, so festered that it turned into a gangrene, in despite of all means used, and so in pain and terror he gave up the ghost and died. For the sin of Sabbath-breaking God embitters his very executions; and the offender must not only die, but he must die upon the rack. . . .

"Two brethren on the Lord's Day, in the forenoon, came to an uncle they had, to dine with him, they living in a market-town not far off. After dinner they took horse again, but had not gone far but one of the horses fell down dead; and these brethren, going back again to their uncle's house, put the other horse into the stable, and within an hour or two that horse likewise died in the place. Thus the insensible beast shall bear the burden of man's sin, and Sabbath-profanation shall be branded upon the brute creatures." (Pp. 684-5, 685-6, 688, 692, 693.)

An abridgment of this work was published at London in 1831 (18mo, pp. 163). The editor states that Mr Wells was of St John's College, Oxford, and died in June 1696.

153. PEARSON, JOHN, *Bishop of Chester* (*died* 1686). —An Exposition of the Creed. 1669.

In the exposition of Article V., Pearson teaches that by Christ's lying in the grave on the seventh day of the week, and rising on the first, "it came to pass that the obligation of the day which was then the Sabbath died and was buried with him, but in a man-

ner by a diurnal transmutation revived again at his resurrection. Well might that day, which carried with it a remembrance of that great deliverance from the Egyptian servitude, resign all the sanctity or solemnity due unto it, when that morning once appeared upon which a far greater redemption was confirmed. . . . . The first day," he adds, "is sanctified, because on that Christ rose from the dead; and the seventh day from that first for ever, because he who rose upon that day, was the same God who created the world and rested on the seventh day." That "this day did the Apostles from the beginning most religiously observe, by their meeting together for holy purposes, and to perform religious duties," he holds to be proved by John xx. 19, 26; Acts ii. 1, 41; xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; and Rev. i. 10. But the sufficiency of these texts to support either this conclusion, or the broader one that the Apostles kept the Sunday as a day of *rest from labour*, has always been denied by the Seventh-day Baptists, and is elaborately controverted by Sir William Domville in his *Examination of the Six Texts commonly adduced from the New Testament in Proof of a Christian Sabbath* (Lond. 1849), to which learned and searching treatise no answer has appeared. Pearson cites in his notes many passages from the Fathers relative to the Lord's Day; including that from Augustine, which Dr Burton pronounces to be spurious (see above, i. 123). These quotations will be found in vol. ii. pp. 229–231 of Dr Burton's edition of Pearson (Oxf. 1847); and the author's own remarks on the Christian Sabbath, partly just quoted, are contained in vol. i. pp. 310–313.

154. HEYLIN, PETER, D.D., *latterly Chaplain to Charles II.* (see Nos. 88 and 135).—Cyprianus Anglicus: or, the History of the Life and Death of the most reverend and renowned Prelate, William, by Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, &c. Lond. 1668. Fol. Pp. 547.

This Life of Laud, being designed as an antidote to Prynne's *Canterbury's Doom* (No. 114), of course regards the royal *Declaration of Sports*, and the proceedings which followed on it, from a point of view by no means identical with that of the Puritans. Heylin's account of the affair will be found in pp. 255–258, 295–297 (partly quoted above, i. 173). In the Introduction, p. 15, he re-asserts his doctrine that the Lord's Day is built on the same foundation with the other holidays of the Church of England. The volume was published after his death, which took place in 1662.

155. CRAFORDIUS, MATTHEW.—Exercitatio Apologetica pro perpetuâ obligatione Quarti Præcepti de Sabbato, ab Ecclesiis Reformatis communiter receptâ, ad-

versus Socinianos, Anabaptistas, Libertinos, Pontificios quosdam, Lutheranos, &c. 1669. 8vo.

156. LEUSDEN, JOHN, *Professor of Hebrew at Utrecht* (*died* 1699).—Philologus Hebræo-Mixtus, Diss. xxxv., xxxvi. Edit. 4ta. Basil. 1739.

157. LIGHTFOOT, JOHN, D.D., *Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge* (*died* 1675).—Whole Works; edited by the Rev. John Rogers Pitman, A.M. Lond. 1822–5. 13 vols. 8vo.

This eminent Rabbinical scholar was a member of the Westminster Assembly, some of the proceedings of which are recorded by him in a Journal quoted above, i. 229. His collected works were originally printed in two volumes folio, 1684; to which an octavo volume of Remains was added in 1700. A copious general index is in the first volume of Mr Pitman's edition.

The opinions of Lightfoot concerning the Sabbath, of course agree in the main with the Westminster Confession; though, as we saw, he would not condemn feasting on the holy day, in the face of the recorded instance of our Lord's attendance at the feast in the Pharisee's house (see above, i. 229, and *Works*, xii. 143). "The Jews' tables," he observes, "were generally better spread on that day than on any others; and that, as they themselves reckoned, upon the account of religion and piety." (xii. 142.)

The following are the chief places where the Sabbath is treated of:—vol. ii. pp. 117, 136, 336, 387; iii. 276; v. 183, 241–6; vii. 367–390 (Sermon on Exod. xx. 11); xi. 191–3, 356–9; xii. 142–4, 285, 302, 556.

In regard to minor points it may be added, that in iii. 56, xi. 157, 187, and xii. 142, 205, the Jewish forms of honouring the Sabbath are described; in iii. 64, xi. 186, and xii. 76, the meaning of Σάββατον δευτεροπρωτον (Luke vi. 1.) is considered; in v. 112, the antiquity and divine institution of synagogues are maintained to be probable; in viii. 43, he argues that "the Pentecost on which the Holy Ghost was given (Acts ii. 1), was the first day of the week, namely, Sunday, or the Lord's Day;" in x. 218, and xii. 219, "a Sabbath-day's journey" is discussed; and in x. 236, he treats as a fable "the Sabbatic river," which according to Pliny was dry every Sabbath-day, but according to Josephus flowed on no other day but the Sabbath (Plin. *Nat. Hist.*, lib. 31, cap. 2; Joseph. *De Bell. Jud.*, lib. 7, cap. 13).

In vol. v., the order of Jesus to the infirm man to take up his bed and walk (John v. 8) is thus commented on:—"Here is a question not unjustly moved, Why would Christ enjoin him to carry his bed on the Sabbath-day? It was contrary to the letter of the

law (Jer. xvii. 21, 22), 'Bear no burden on the Sabbath-day,' &c. It was extremely contrary to their traditions. For 'bringing a thing out and in, from one place to another, was a work, and one of the special works forbidden to be done on the Sabbath-day' (Maim. *in Shab.*, cap. 12); and 'he that carrieth any thing on the Sabbath in his right hand or left, or in his bosom, or upon his shoulder, he is guilty' (*Talm. in Sab.*, cap. 10). And it was dangerous to bring him either to whipping or to suffer death (Leusden, p. 534).

"The most general answer that is given is, that 'Christ would have him hereby to show, that he was perfectly and entirely healed,—when he, that could not stir before, is able now to carry his bed:' and so by this action, at once, he gives a public testimony of the benefit received, and an evident demonstration of the perfectness of the cure.

"But both these might have been done abundantly, only by his walking sound and well, seeing that he could not walk nor stir of so long before. A man that had been so diseased so long a space, and had lain at these waters so great a time, for him now to walk strongly and well, would show the benefit received, and the cure done, as well as walking with his bed on his back. There was, therefore, more in this command of Christ, than what did barely refer to the publication of the miracle; and that may be apprehended to have been, partly, in respect of the man,—and, partly, in respect of the day.

"In respect of the man,—it was to try his faith and obedience, whether, upon the command of Christ, he durst and would venture upon so hazardous an action, as to carry his bed on the Sabbath-day, which might prove death, or sore beating to him: and he relies upon the word of him that commanded, and casts off fear, and does it. And to this sense his own words do construe the command, when the Jews question him upon the fact: 'He that made me whole, gave me warrant to do it; for he bade me, and said, Take up thy bed and walk.' He whose power was able for such a cure, his word was warrant for such an action. And, as our Saviour stirs up his faith in his question before, 'Wilt thou be made whole?'—so he tries what it is in this command, 'Take up thy bed, and carry it home:' for so we must construe what Christ meant by *walking*, from the like expression, Mark ii. 9, with ver. 11.

"In respect of the day,—it was to show Christ's power over the Sabbath; and as, in healing of the palsie man (Mark ii. 9), he would not only show his power over the disease, but also over sin, and so forgave it; so it pleased him, in this passage, to show his power over the Sabbath, to dispense with it, and to dispose of it as he thought good, as he showed his command over the malady that he cured.

"And here is the first apparent sign towards the shaking and alteration of the Sabbath, in regard of the day, that we meet withal; and, indeed, a greater we hardly meet with, till the alteration of the day came. To heal diseases, and to pluck off ears of corn for

necessary repast, on the Sabbath-day, had their warrant even in the law itself, and in all reason: but to enjoin this man to carry his bed on that day, and to bear it home, whereas the bed might very well have lain there till the Sabbath was over; and his home was no one knows how far off;—certainly it showeth that he intended to show his authority over the Sabbath, and to try the man's faith and obedience, in a singular manner. . . . . The speech of Christ, 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work,' &c., was made by him before the Sanhedrim, before which he was called to answer for what he had done on the Sabbath-day. . . . . As God doth good on the Sabbath, dispensing his ordinances, sending rains and sunshine, providing food for all flesh, &c.; so Christ did good on this Sabbath, healing a disease, and recovering a man from so long an infirmity. Herein the parallel holdeth clearly: but Christ went a step farther; for he commanded the man to carry his bed, which tended to the visible violation of the Sabbath, which God's providential actings do not do. It is true, indeed, that God also commanded the priests of the temple to work on the Sabbath, in killing, slaying, and sacrificing beasts; but this was for the greater promotion of his service: and he commanded Joshua to march about Jericho on the Sabbath-day; but that was for the more forwarding of the public good: but this command to the man to carry his bed, tended neither to the one end nor to the other, but merely and mainly to show the power and authority that Christ had over the Sabbath. Scan but considerately that command and action, and you will find the tendency of it, so directly and properly, to nothing as to this very thing. Say, 'it was to show the completeness of the cure;'—that might have been sufficiently, and indeed as much, showed, either by the man's sound walking without his bed, or by carrying his bed the next day. Was it more for the glorifying of God? Regarding the bare action, one would suppose, that to have kept the Sabbath, and not giving offence to others, might have tended to that end more fairly. There was, therefore this chief thing in it, besides the trial of the man's faith and obedience,—that Christ would glorify his divine power and authority, in showing his command and disposal, that he had over the Sabbath.

"Therefore, whereas his pleading, 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work,' does answer most directly but to one objection that lay against him,—namely, for healing on the Sabbath; yet doth it satisfy the other sufficiently, which was his command to the man to carry his bed: for he that wrought in other things, with the same authority that the Father worketh, he also hath the same authority over the Sabbath that the Father hath; who as he ordained it, so can he dispense with it, as pleaseth him.

"Now Christ, in this command, cannot be conceived to have intended to vilify the Sabbath, as it was a day of rest,—or to lay that ordinance, of keeping such a day of rest unto the Lord, in the dirt; but he that was to alter the Sabbath to a new day, and in that equality of working which he had with the Father,—he was

to set a new Sabbath-day, upon the finishing of the work of redemption, as the Father had done the old, upon the creation: and, therefore, as in preface to such a thing, he both giveth such a command, and pleadeth for what he had done, from his divine authority, as beginning to shake the day, which, within two years, was to be changed to another. The proof of the divine institution of the day of the Christian Sabbath, may be begun here." (Vol. v. pp. 241-6.)

The fact that there was no controversy in the early ages of Christianity about the keeping of the Lord's Day, is thought by some late writers to militate against the opinion that the Sabbath *had* been transferred to the first day of the week; since, if it had, the opponents of those Judaizing Christians who in the third and fourth centuries maintained the obligation to observe both the seventh-day Sabbath and the Lord's Day, must have used (which they never did) the silencing argument, that the observance of the first day superseded of necessity that of the seventh. (See *The Modern Sabbath Examined*, p. 138; Hengstenberg, p. 53; Cox, p. 530.) Lightfoot, however, without seeming to have this important fact in view, says:—"The first day of the week was everywhere celebrated for the Christian Sabbath; and—which is not to be passed over without observing—as far as appears from Scripture, there is nowhere any dispute of that matter. There was controversy concerning circumcision, and other points of the Jewish religion, whether they were to be retained or not retained; but nowhere, as we read, concerning the changing of the Sabbath. There were indeed some Jews converted to the Gospel, who, as in some other things they retained a smatch of their old Judaism, so they did in the observation of days, Rom. xiv. 5, Gal. iv. 10; but yet not rejecting or neglecting the Lord's Day. They celebrated it and made no manner of scruple, as appears, concerning it; but they would have their old festival-days retained too, and they disputed not at all whether the Lord's Day were to be celebrated, but whether the Jewish Sabbath were not to be celebrated also." (Vol. xii. p. 556). On the supposition of the other writers just referred to, that no Christian Sabbath had by this time been set up, controversy *could not* occur: and it is to be considered whether the opposite assumption of Lightfoot is compatible with Paul's statement in Rom. xiv. 5, that of those he addressed, one party "esteemed *every day* alike," and was blameless in doing so.

158. HUGHES, GEORGE, B.D.—Aphorisms, or Select Propositions of the Scripture, shortly determining the Doctrine of the Sabbath. 1670.

159. OWEN, JOHN, D.D., *the most eminent of the Independent divines* (*died* 1683).—Exercitations concerning the Name, Original, Nature, Use, and Continuance, of

a Day of Sacred Rest. Wherein the Original of the Sabbath from the Foundation of the World, the Morality of the Fourth Commandment, with the Change of the Seventh Day, are inquired into. Together with an Assertion of the Divine Institution of the Lord's Day, and Practical Directions for its due Observation. Lond. 1671. 8vo. Pp. 454.

This treatise was afterwards included by its author among his *Preliminary Exercitations to the Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, of which it forms Nos. 35–40. Two editions of the *Exposition* (with the *Exercitations* prefixed), each in seven volumes 8vo, have been printed in Edinburgh during the present century—Wright's in 1814, and Goold's in 1854; the latter forming vols. xviii.–xxiv. of Goold's excellent edition of the entire *Works* of Owen, but being sold also separately. The six *Exercitations concerning the Day of Sacred Rest* are contained in the second of these separate volumes, which is vol. xix. of the *Works*. There is a London edition of the *Preliminary Exercitations* apart from the *Exposition* (1 vol. 8vo, 1840), of which see pp. 601–750.

Dr Owen stands in the front rank of those who have advocated the divine authority and moral nature of the Christian Sabbath. His learning, acuteness, earnestness, charity, good sense and vigorous style, contribute to render his work, even at this day, one of the strongest supports of the Sabbatarian cause. Its chief distinctive feature is the great stress laid upon Heb. iv. 3-11, as a direct scriptural authority for the Christian Sabbath. This passage he expounds very fully; for although, says he, "it is touched on by all who have contended about the original and duration of the Sabbatical rest, it has not yet, that I know of, been diligently examined by any. I shall not fear to lay much of the weight of the cause wherein I am engaged upon it, and therefore shall take a view of the whole context, and the design of the apostle therein." (*Exerc.* 5, § 11.) Except, however, by Dr Wardlaw and some minor disputants in the Sabbath controversy, the passage has been generally understood as referring solely to the repose of the saints in heaven; and in a recent Prize Essay on "The Universality and Perpetuity of the Sabbath," the writer "deems it better to waive what after all must be confessed to be but dubious support." (*Defence of the Universality, &c.*, by Alex. Oliver, p. 49. Edin. 1852.) Nor should the fact be overlooked that the epistle was addressed to Jews by a Jewish writer—usually thought to be Paul, but whom Neander concludes to have been most probably "an apostolic man of the Pauline school." (*Hist. of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, p. 347; translation in *Bohn's Standard Library*.)

Dr Owen is one of those who see, in the caution given by Jesus to his disciples about praying that their flight might not be on the

Sabbath-day (Matt. xxiv. 20), a declaration of "the continued obligation of the law of the Sabbath, as a moral precept upon all." (*Exerc.* 3, § 47.) But here also many even of the Sabbatarians have found reason to dissent.

After giving an excellent summary of the disputed points about the Sabbath (*Exerc.* 1, §§ 4-6, quoted by Cox, pp. 322-325), he adds, with admirable candour and modesty:—

"The truth is, most of the different apprehensions recounted, have been entertained and contended for, by persons learned and godly, all equally pretending to a love unto truth, and care for the preservation and promotion of holiness and godliness amongst men. And it were to be wished that this were the only instance whereby we might evince, that the best of men in this world do know but in part, and prophesy but in part. But they are too many to be recounted, although most men act in themselves and towards others, as if they were themselves liable to no mistakes, and that it is an inexpiable crime in others, to be in anything mistaken. But as this should make us jealous over ourselves, and our own apprehensions in this matter; so ought the consideration of it to affect us with tenderness and forbearance towards those who dissent from us, and whom we therefore judge to err, and be mistaken.

"But that which principally we are to learn from this consideration, is, with what care and diligence we ought to inquire into the certain rule of truth in this matter. For whatever we do determine, we shall be sure to find men learned and godly otherwise minded. And yet in our determinations are the consciences of the disciples of Christ greatly concerned, which ought not by us to be causelessly burdened, nor yet countenanced in the neglect of any duty that God doth require. Slight and perfunctory disquisitions will be of little use in this matter; nor are men to think that their opinions are firm and established, when they have obtained a seeming countenance unto them from two or three doubtful texts of Scripture. The principles and foundations of truth in this matter lie deep, and require a diligent investigation." (§ 7.)

The advocates of the seventh-day Sabbath are answered in *Exercitation* 5, §§ 32-35.

At the only place where reference is made to Rom. xiv. 5, nothing more is said of that passage than that, along with Gal. iv. 10, and Col. ii. 16, 17, it proves a "common consent that whatever in the institution and observance of the Sabbath under the Old Testament was peculiar unto that state of the Church, either in its own nature, or in its use and signification, or in its manner of observance, is taken away by virtue of those rules." (*Exerc.* 5, § 29.)

We have already seen the alarm into which Dr Owen was thrown by the discovery that the original text of Scripture had not been preserved from such corruption as all other ancient books have undergone in the hands of transcribers. (Above, i. 269.) Another source of anxiety to him was the general reception which his con-

temporaries were giving to the Copernican system of the universe, so different from what had been understood by all the world in former ages to be clearly revealed in the first chapter of Genesis. This "late hypothesis fixing the sun as in the centre of the world," he pronounces to be "built on fallible phenomena, and advanced by many arbitrary presumptions, against evident testimonies of Scripture, and reasons as probable as any which are produced in its confirmation." (*Exerc.* 2, § 16.) Probably the bearing of this great discovery on the question about a primeval Sabbath was more fully apprehended by him than it has commonly been.

Regarding the mode of spending the day of sacred rest, he writes with great moderation :—

"Although," says he, "the day be wholly to be dedicated unto the ends of a sacred rest before insisted on, yet,

"1. Duties in their performance drawn out unto such a length as to beget wearisomeness and satiety, tend not unto edification, nor do any way promote the sanctification of the name of God in the worship itself. Regard, therefore, in all such performances is to be had, 1. Unto the weakness of the natural constitution of some, the infirmities and indispositions of others, who are not able to abide in the outward part of duties, as others can. And there is no wise shepherd, but will rather suffer the stronger sheep of his flock to lose somewhat of what they might reach unto in his guidance of them, than to compel the weaker to keep pace with them to their hurt, and it may be their ruin. Better a great number should complain of the shortness of some duties, who have strength and desires for a longer continuance in them, than that a few who are sincere should be really discouraged by being overburdened, and have the service thereby made useless unto them. 'I always loved in sacred duties, that observation of Seneca concerning the orations of Cassius Severus, when they heard him, 'Timebamus ne desineret:' 'We were afraid that he would end.' 2. To the spiritual edge of the affections of men, which ought to be whetted, and not through tediousness in duties abated and taken off. Other things of a like nature might be added, which for some considerations I shall forbear.

"2. Refreshments helpful to nature, so far as to refresh it, that it may have a supply of spirits to go on cheerfully in the duties of holy worship, are lawful and useful. To macerate the body with abstinences on this day, is required of none; and to turn it into a fast, or to fast upon it, is generally condemned by the ancients. Wherefore, to forbear provision of necessary food for families on this day, is Mosaical; and the enforcement of the particular precepts, about not kindling fire in our houses on this day, baking and preparing the food of it the day before, cannot be insisted on without a reintroduction of the seventh day precisely, to whose observation they were annexed, and thereby of the law and spirit of the old covenant. Provided always that these refreshments be, 1. Seasonable for the time of them, and not when public duties require our attendance on them. 2. Accompanied with a singular

regard unto the rules of temperance; as 1. That there be no appearance of evil; 2. That nature be not charged with any kind of excess, so far as to be hindered rather than assisted in the duties of the day; 3. That they be accompanied with gravity, and sobriety, and purity of conversation. Now, whereas these things are in the substance of them required of us in the whole course of our lives, as we intend to please God, and to come to the enjoyment of him, none ought to think an especial regard unto them on this day to be a bondage, or troublesome unto them.

"3. Labour or pains for the enjoyment of the benefit and advantage of the solemn assemblies of the church, and in them of the appointed worship of God, is so far from intrenching on the rest of this day, that it belongs unto its due observation. A mere bodily rest is no part of religious worship in itself; nor doth it belong unto the sanctification of this day, any further than as it is a means for the due performance of the other duties belonging unto it. We have no bounds under the Gospel for a Sabbath's-day's journey, provided it be for Sabbath ends. In brief, all pains or labour that our station and condition in this world, that our troubles which may befal us, or anything else, make necessary, as that without which we cannot enjoy the solemn ends and uses of this holy day of rest, are no way inconsistent with the due observation of it. It may be the lot of one man to take so much pains, and to travel so far for and in the due celebration of the Lord's Day, as if another should do the like, without his occasions and circumstances, it would be a profanation of it.

"4. Labour in works of charity or necessity, such as are to visit the sick, to relieve the poor, to help the distressed, to relieve or assist creatures ready to perish, to supply cattle with necessary food, is allowed by all, and hath been by many spoken unto.

"5. For sports and such like recreations, and their use on this day, I refer the reader to laws of sundry emperors and nations concerning them. See of Constant. *Leg. Omnes, cap. de Feriis,* Theodosius and Arcadius, *ibid.*, and of Leo and Authemius in the same place of the *Code;* of Charles the Great, *Capitular.* lib. 1, cap. 81, lib. 5, cap. 188. The sum of them all is contained in that exhortation which Ephrem Syrus expresseth in his *Serm. de Diebus Festis.* 'Festivitates Dominicas honorare studiose contendite, celebrantes eas non panegyrice, sed divine; non mundane, sed spiritualiter; non instar Gentilium, sed Christianorum. Quare non portarum frontes coronemus; non choreas ducamus, non chorum exornemus; non tibiis et citharis auditum effæminemus, non mollibus vestibus induamur, nec cingulis undique auro radiantibus cingamur; non comessationibus et ebrietatibus dediti simus, verum ista relinquamus eis quorum Deus venter est, et gloria in confusione justorum.'

"For private duties, both personal and domestic, they are either antecedent or consequent unto the solemn public worship, as usually for time it is celebrated amongst us. These consisting in the known religious exercises of prayer, reading the Scripture, meditation, family instructions from the advantage of the public ordinances,

they are to be recommended unto every one's conscience, ability, and opportunity, as they shall find strength and assistance for them." (*Exerc.* 6, § 19.)

These remarks, and the yet stronger passage formerly quoted (ii. 15.) against loading worshippers with Sabbath performances beyond their strength, gave offence to several of Owen's brethren; one of whom—John Eliot, the apostle of the American Indians—wrote him an expostulatory letter. In his reply, which is published by Cotton Mather in his *Life of Eliot*, p. 27 (Lond. 1694), the following explanation is given:—"As to what concerns the *natural strength of man*, either I was under some mistake in my expression, or you seem to be so in your apprehension. I never thought, and I have not said, that the *continuance* of the Sabbath is to be commensurate to the natural strength of man, but only that it is an *allowable mean* of men's *continuance* in Sabbath duties; which, I suppose, you will not deny, lest you should cast the consciences of professors into inextricable difficulties. When first I engaged in that work, I intended not to have spoken one word about the *practical observation* of the day, but only to have endeavoured the *revival* of a truth, which at present is despised among *us*, and strenuously opposed by sundry Divines of the United Provinces, who call the doctrine of the Sabbath *Figmentum Anglicanum*. On the desire of some learned men in these parts, it was, that I undertook the vindication of it. Having now discharged the debt which in this matter I owed to the truth, and to the Church of God, though not as I ought, yet with such a composition as, I hope, through the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, might find acceptance with God, and with his saints, I suppose I shall not again engage on that subject." He adds in touching language:—"I suppose there is scarce any one alive in the world, who hath more reproaches cast upon him than I have; though hitherto God has been pleased, in some measure, to support my spirit under them. I still relieved myself by this, that my poor endeavours have found acceptance with the Churches of Christ. But my holy, wise, and gracious Father sees it needful to try me in this matter also; and what I have received from you, which, it may be, contains not your sense alone, hath printed deeper, and left a greater impression on my mind, than all the virulent revilings and false accusations I have met with from my professed adversaries. I do acknowledge to you, that I have a dry and barren spirit, and I do heartily beg your prayers, that the Holy One would, notwithstanding all my sinful provocations, water me from above: but that I should now be apprehended to have given a wound to *holiness* in the churches, *is one of the saddest frowns in the cloudy brows of Divine Providence*. The doctrine of the Sabbath, I have asserted, though not as it ought yet as well as I could; the observation of it in holy duties to the utmost of the strength for them, which God shall be pleased to give us, I have pleaded for; the necessity also of a serious preparation for it, in sundry previous duties, I have declared. But now to meet with severe expressions—it may be, 'tis the will of God, that

vigour should hereby be given to my former discouragements, and that there is a call in it to cease from these kinds of labours."

Cotton Mather says he publishes this letter, "that it may contribute unto the world's good reception and perusal of a golden book on the Sabbath of God, written by one of the most eminent persons which the English nation has been adorned with." (P. 30.)

160. BAXTER, RICHARD, *a very eminent Nonconformist divine* (*died* 1691).—Practical Works; with a Life of the Author, and a Critical Examination of his Writings, by the Rev. William Orme. Lond. 1830. 23 vols. 8vo.

In vol. xiii., pp. 363–516, is a treatise published by Baxter in 1671, entitled "The Divine appointment of the Lord's Day proved, as a separated day for holy worship, especially in the Church assemblies; and consequently the cessation of the Seventh-day Sabbath."

In spite of the haste with which this appears to have been written, it has always been justly esteemed, except by the Seventh-day Baptists and the Puritans, as one of the most valuable defences of the Christian Sabbath as a divine institution. Its origin and purpose are thus made known in the Preface:—

"Reader, if thou think this Treatise both superfluous and defective, when so many larger have better done the work already, I shall not at all gainsay the latter, nor much the former. The reason of my writing it was the necessity and request of some very upright, godly persons, who are lately fallen into doubt or error, in point of the Sabbath-day; conceiving, that because the Fourth Commandment was written in stone, it is wholly unchangeable, and consequently the Seventh-day Sabbath in force, and that the Lord's Day is not a day separated by God to holy worship. I knew that there was enough written on this subject long ago; But, 1. Much of it is in Latin. 2. Some writings which prove the abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath, do withal treat so loosely of the Lord's Day, as that they require a confutation in the latter, as well as a commendation for the former. 3. Some are so large, that the persons that I write for will hardly be brought to read them. 4. Most go upon those grounds which I take to be less clear; and build so much more than I can do on the Fourth Commandment and on many passages of the Old Testament, and plead so much for the old sabbatical notion and rest, that I fear this is the chief occasion of many people's errors; who when they find themselves in a wood of difficulties, and nothing plain and convincing that is pleaded with them, do therefore think it safest to stick to the old Jewish Sabbath. The friends and acquaintance of some of these persons importuning me to take the plainest and nearest way to satisfy such honest doubters, I have here done it according to my judgment: not contending against any that go another way to work, but thinking myself that this is very clear and satisfactory; viz., to prove, 1. That Christ

did commission his apostles to teach us all things which he commanded, and to settle orders in his Church. 2. And that he gave them his Spirit to enable them to do all this infallibly, by bringing all his words to their remembrance, and by leading them into all truth. 3. And that his apostles by this Spirit did *de facto* separate the Lord's Day for holy worship, especially in church-assemblies, and declared the cessation of the Jewish Sabbaths. 4. And that as this change had the very same author as the holy Scriptures (the Holy Ghost in the Apostles), so that fact hath the same kind of proof, that we have of the canon and the integrity and uncorruptness of the particular Scripture-books and texts: and that, if so much Scripture as mentioneth the keeping of the Lord's Day, expounded by the consent and practice of the universal Church from the days of the apostles (all keeping this day as holy, without the dissent of any one sect, or single person, that I remember to have read of), I say, if history will not fully prove the point of fact, that this day was kept in the apostles' times, and consequently by their appointment, then the same proof will not serve to evince that any text of Scripture is canonical, and uncorrupted; nor can we think that any thing in the world, that is past, can have historical proof.

"I have been put to say something particularly out of antiquity for this evidence of the fact, because it is that which I lay the greatest stress upon. But I have not done it so largely as might be done: 1. Because I would not lose the unlearned reader in a wood of history, nor overwhelm him instead of edifying him. 2. Because it is done already in Latin by Dr Young in his *Dies Dominica* (under the name of Theophilus Loncardiensis); which I take to be the most moderate, sound, and strong Treatise on this subject that I have seen: though Mr Cawdrey and Palmer (jointly) have done well, and at greater length; and Mr Eaton, Mr Shepard, Dr Bound, Walæus, Rivet, and my dear friend Mr George Abbot, against Broad, have said very much: and in their way, Dr White, Dr Heylin, Bishop Ironside, Mr Brerewood, &c. 3. I chose most of the same citations which Dr Heylin himself produceth, because he being the man that I am most put to defend myself against, his concessions are my advantage. 4. And if I had been willing, I could not have been so full in this as the subject will bespeak, because I have almost eleven years been separated from my library, and long from the neighbourhood of any one's else.

"I much pity and wonder at those godly men, who are so much for stretching the words of Scripture, to a sense that other men cannot find in them, as that in the word *graven images* in the Second Commandment, they can find all set forms of prayer, all composed studied sermons, and all things about worship of man's invention to be images or idolatry; and yet they cannot find the abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath in the express words of Col. ii. 16, nor the other texts which I have cited; nor can they find the institution of the Lord's Day in all the texts and evidences produced for it. But though Satan may somewhat disturb our concord, and tempt some men's charity to remissness, by these differences, he shall never

keep them out of heaven, who worship God through Christ, by the Spirit, even in spirit and truth. Nor shall he, I hope, ever draw me to think such holy persons as herein differ from me, to be worse than myself, though I think them in this to be unhappily mistaken: much less to approve of their own separation from others, or of other men's condemning them as heretics, and inflicting severities upon them for these their opinions' sake." (Vol. xiii. pp. 365-7.)

After maintaining in seven chapters the propositions laid down in the Preface, he treats in chap. 8 of "the beginning of the Lord's Day;" in chap. 9, of "the manner in which it should be kept or used;" and in chap. 10, of "how it should not be spent, or what is unlawful on it" (dancing, and plays, and wakes, and other pastimes, such as had been practised under the sanction of the *Book of Sports*,* being especially condemned). Chap. 11 is entitled, "What things should not be scrupled as unlawful on the Lord's day;" chap. 12, "Of what importance the due observation of the Lord's Day is;" and chap. 13, "What other Church-Festivals or separated days are lawful." Lastly comes "An Appendix for further confirmation of God's own separation of the Lord's Day, and disproving the continuation of the Jewish Seventh-day Sabbath."

The doctrine of Baxter, that no part whatever of the law promulgated to the Jews obliges Christians, has been quoted above, i. 244. On this principle he argues in the treatise under our notice, though of course admitting that the law of nature, of which the Decalogue includes so much, is universally and perpetually binding.† How far the Fourth Commandment is moral is considered in pp. 426-7, 501, 505.

Like Grotius, he thinks that bodily rest was not prescribed at the creation when the seventh day was blessed and sanctified, but only to the Jews by Moses; and that though it was a primary part of *their* religious observation of the Sabbath, the Lord's Day on the other hand "is appointed but as a seasonable time subservient

* It is in this chapter, p. 444, that Baxter has recorded his often-quoted reminiscences of the offensive manner in which the Sunday sports were conducted in the time of Charles I. They confirm to some extent the following passage in Southey's *Book of the Church*: "The motives for the King's Declaration were unobjectionably good; but the just liberty which in happier times, and under proper parochial discipline, would have been in all respects useful, proved injurious in the then distempered state of public feeling. It displeased the well-intentioned part of the Calvinised clergy, *and it was abused in officious triumph* by those who were glad of an opportunity for insulting the professors of a sour and dismal morality." (Chap. xvii., p. 447, 4th edit.)

† In another work he says: "So much of Moses's laws as are part of the law of nature, or of any positive law of Christ, or of the civil law of any state, are binding as they are such natural, Christian, or civil laws. But not one of them as Mosaical; though the Mosaical law is of great use to help us to understand the law of nature in many particular instances in which it is somewhat difficult to us." (*Christian Directory*, Part IV., chap. xix.; vol. vi. p. 322.)

to the spiritual work of the day; . . . and therefore no bodily labour is now unlawful, but such as is a hinderance to the spiritual work of the day (or accidentally a scandal and temptation to others),—whereas the breach of the outward rest of the Jews' Sabbath was a sin directly of itself, without hinderance of, or respect to, the spiritual worship." (P. 422; see also 427, 450, 452, 515.) He therefore prefers the name "Lord's Day" to "the Christian Sabbath,"—a phrase which, when used, as he says it sometimes was, by the first Churches, was employed only analogically, as they used the names "sacrifice" and "altar." (P. 369.)

Of several texts which have been widely discussed, he says: "I am not ignorant that many of the English divines long ago expounded Matt. xxiv. 20, of the Christian Sabbath, and Col. ii. 16, as exclusive of the Jewish weekly Sabbath: but so do not most expositors, for which I think they give very good reasons, which I will not stand here to repeat." (P. 515; also, as to Col. ii., pp. 421, 473, 485, 496). In Acts xx. 7, he finds an express mention, and in 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, and John xxi., intimations, that the Lord's Day "is principally to be spent in holy assemblies." (Pp. 429, 474.) Of Rom. xiv. he observes only, that, as the converted Gentiles at Rome were taught by the apostle not to despise the weak that observed meats and days, so "we must not be contentious, contemptuous, nor censorious against one another, about things of no greater moment than the Jewish days were, though some observed them without just cause: because the kingdom of God consisteth not in meats and drinks and days, but in righteousness, and peaceableness, and joy in the Holy Ghost." (Pp. 509, 465.)

His assertions, that "it hath been the constant practice of all Christ's churches in the whole world, ever since the days of the apostles to this day, to assemble for public worship on the Lord's Day, *as a day set apart thereunto by the apostles*" (p. 385), and that all the churches "*professed to observe it as an apostolical ordinance*" (p. 407), are unsupported by a single passage among the many he adduces from the Fathers; and, being at variance with the positive declarations of sundry respectable writers (see above, i. 125), they cannot be implicitly received on the bare word even of Baxter.

Among his arguments against the Seventh-day Baptists is this—that if a law to Adam for the observance of the seventh day continued to bind his posterity after the coming of Christ, our Lord and his apostles, and all succeeding pastors of the churches, would not have passed by this positive law to Adam without any mention of it. (P. 417.) A similar argument has lately been employed by Sir William Domville against the opinion of the Puritans that *some* primeval Sabbath-law continued in force after the cessation of the Jewish Sabbath. "St Paul," says he, "told his heathen converts, in his Epistles to the Romans, the Galatians, and the Colossians, that they were not bound to observe Sabbath-days. Now it is absolutely incredible that when thus writing to them concerning Sabbath-days, he should have omitted to inform them, that although not bound to observe the Jewish Sabbath, they were un-

der an obligation, long lost sight of by heathen nations, but which still subsisted in its primeval force, to observe a Sabbath commanded to all mankind at the creation of the world. If St Paul knew of the existence of any such obligation, it was his duty, as the apostle of the Gentiles, to proclaim it to his heathen converts, and earnestly to exhort them to a strict and immediate compliance with it. He has done nothing of the kind; he therefore knew of no such obligation, nor of any such tenet being held in his time either by Jew or Christian as that of a Creation Sabbath." (*The Sabbath; or, an Inquiry into the Supposed Obligation of the Sabbaths of the Old Testament*, p. 130; see also 144).

Baxter's views about the times of the beginning and ending of the Lord's Day are probably those which have most frequently occurred to sober Christians, and have tended most to satisfy worshipers in Britain and elsewhere that they need not follow the practice which survives in New England,—and worshipers in New England that their practice need not be exchanged for that of the remainder of Christendom. He says:—

"If we can tell when any day beginneth, we may know when the Lord's Day beginneth. If we cannot, the necessity of our ignorance will shorten the trouble of our scruples by excusing us.

"Because the Lord's Day is not to be kept as a Jewish Sabbath ceremoniously, but the time and the rest are here commanded subserviently for the work's sake, therefore we have not so much reason to be scrupulous about the hours of beginning and ending, as the Jews had about their Sabbath.

"I think he that judgeth of the beginning and ending of the day according to the common estimation of the country where he liveth, will best answer the ends of the institution. For he will keep still the same proportion of time; and so much as is ordinarily allowed on other days for work, he will spend this day in holy works; and so much in rest as is used to be spent in rest on other days (which may ordinarily satisfy a well-informed conscience). And if any extraordinary occasions (as journeying or the like), require him to doubt of any hours of the night, whether they be part of the Lord's Day or not; 1. It will be but his sleeping-time, and not his worshipping-time, which he will be in doubt of: And, 2. He will avoid all scandal and tempting others to break the day, if he measure the day by the common estimate; whereas, if the country where he liveth do esteem the day to begin at sun-setting, and he suppose it to begin at midnight, he may be scandalous by doing that which in the common opinion is a violation of the day. If I thought that this short kind of solution were not the fittest to afford just quietness to the minds of sober Christians in this point, I would take the pains to scan the controversy about the true beginning of days: but lest it more puzzle and perplex than edify or resolve and quiet the conscience, I save myself and the reader that trouble." (Pp. 428–9.)

Sabbath-spenders are divided by Baxter into two classes—"the hypocrite, that draweth near to God but with his lips while his

heart is far from Him;" and "the sincere experienced Christian, serving God in spirit and in truth." To the latter, the religious exercises of the day are "true and spiritual recreation, pleasure and benefit; and therefore," he adds, "we see that the holy experienced believers are still averse to sensual diversions, and do not think the Lord's Day or his service too long." (P. 447.) Here he doubtless speaks from the experience of his fervently pious mind. But to the saints and hypocrites he might have added a *third* class, comprising the multitude whose religious feelings are naturally cold, and who, not choosing *to be* hypocrites, incur the censure of the devout, and of hypocrites too, by not engaging all day in exercises which, for the most part, would necessarily be but a *show* of worship.

In his *Christian Directory*, Part I. ch. 4., he teaches, though not with reference to the Lord's Day in particular, that "the body must, as far as we can, be kept in that condition that is fittest for the service of the soul;" since "it is not the life of the body, but the health and the cheerfulness, which maketh it fit for duty; and so much pleasing of the flesh as tendeth but to its health and cheerfulness is a duty, where it can be done without greater hurt the other way. A heavy body," he adds, "is but a dull and heavy servant to the mind; yea, a great impediment to the soul in duty, and a great temptation to many sins. . . . When the sights of prospects, and beautiful buildings, and fields and countries, or the use of walks or gardens, do tend to raise the soul to holy contemplation, to admire the Creator, and to think of the glory of the life to come (as Bernard used his pleasant walks), this delight is lawful, if not a duty, where it may be had. So when music doth cheer the mind, and fit it for thanks and praise to God; and when the rest of the body, and the use of your best apparel, and moderate feasting, on the Lord's Day and other days of thanksgiving, do promote the spiritual service of the day, they are good and profitable; but to those that are more hindered by fulness, even abstinence on such days is best." (*Works*, vol. iii. p. 102–3.) Again, in his *Directions for getting Spiritual Peace and Comfort*, he says: "All our preaching will do little to win souls from sensuality to holiness, while they look upon the sad lives of the professors of holiness." (Vol. ix. p. 282.) And lastly, in *The Saint's Everlasting Rest*: "I admonish all those that are possessed of the censorious devil, that if they see a poor Christian walking privately in the fields on the Lord's Day, they would not pharisaically conclude him a Sabbath-breaker till they know more." (Vol. xxiii. p. 326.) In which application of the word "pharisaical" he does a little injustice to the Pharisees; for they walked *publicly* in the fields on the Sabbath-day, and, there meeting Jesus and his disciples, found no fault but with the *work* of plucking and rubbing the ears of corn.

Baxter's rule for determining works of necessity which may and ought to be done on the Lord's Day, is perhaps the best that can be given: "Your labour is then lawful and a duty, when, in the judgment of a truly judicious person, it is like to do more good

than hurt; and it is then sinful, when it is like to do more hurt than good. Though all cannot discern this, yet (as far as I know) this is the true rule to judge such actions." (Vol. xiii. p. 456.)

Of other holy-days than the Lord's Day he delivers his opinion thus:—

"The great blessing of an apostolic ministry, and of the stability of the martyrs in their sufferings for Christ, being so rare and notable a mercy to the Church, I confess I know no reason why the churches of all succeeding ages may not keep an anniversary-day of thanksgiving to God for Peter, or Paul, or Stephen, as well as for the Powder-plot deliverance. I know not where God hath forbidden it, directly or indirectly. If his instituting the Lord's Day were a virtual prohibition for man to separate any more, or if the prohibition of adding to God's word were against it, they would be against other days of humiliation and thanksgiving, especially anniversary; which we confess they are not. If the reason be scandal, lest the men should have the honour instead of God, I answer,—1. An honour is due to apostles and martyrs in their places, in meet subordination to God. 2. Where the case of scandal is notorious, it may become by that accident unlawful, and yet not be so in other times and places.

"The devil hath here been a great undoer by overdoing: When he knew not how else to cast out the holy observation of the Lord's Day with zealous people, he found out the trick of devising so many days called holy-days to set up by it, that the people might perceive that the observation of them all as holy, was never to be expected. And so the Lord's Day was jumbled in the heap of holy-days, and all turned into ceremony, by the Papists, and too many other churches in the world. Which became Calvin's temptation (as his own words make plain), to think too meanly of the Lord's Day with the rest. . . . . .

"The controversy, Whether it be lawful to separate an anniversary-day for the commemoration of Christ's nativity, circumcision, and such like things, which were equally existent in the apostles' days, and the reason for observing them equal with following times (and so the apostles had the same reason to have appointed such days had they thought it best, as we have), I acknowledge too hard for me to determine. Not being able to prove it lawful, I cannot own and justify it; and not seeing a plain prohibition, I will not condemn it, nor be guilty of unpeaceable opposing church-customs or authority in it, but behave myself as a peaceable doubter." (Vol. xiii. pp. 464–6.)

In his *Christian Directory*, Part II., there is a chapter (the 18th) entitled, "Directions for the holy spending of the Lord's Day in families." (Vol. iv. pp. 240–251.)—In *The Life of Faith*, Part II. ch. 7, he affirms the tradition of its observance from the Apostles. (Vol. xii. pp. 132–3.)—The Fourth Commandment is discussed in *The Catechising of Families*, ch. 37 (vol. xix. pp. 185–196); which chapter is a summary of the views more largely expressed in his treatise on the Lord's Day.

His biographer, Mr Orme, considers that the ground taken in that treatise "is the only scriptural and satisfactory ground of the divine obligation of this sacred day. It places it correctly on the footing of a New Testament ordinance; while it does not deprive it of all that support from the analogy of the original appointment of a day of rest, and of the Mosaical institution, which it may properly have. Unless we reason from the recorded example of the apostles and primitive Christians, and regard that example as not less binding than apostolic precept, we shall find very little authority for most of the ordinances of Christianity." (*Life of Baxter*, p. 570.) For thus discarding the Fourth Commandment as the foundation of the Lord's Day, Mr Orme is taken to task by Mr Conder in the *Eclectic Review* for Nov. 1830, p. 407; while, on the other hand, not only has the assumed equality of apostolic example to apostolic precept been called in question (Brerewood, quoted above, i. 161; Milton's *Christian Doctrine*, B. ii. ch. 7, quoted below, p. 53; Cox, p. 328), but the evidence that in fact any such example of observance of the Lord's Day was set, is thought by many to be inadequate.

161. SELLERS, WILLIAM.—An Examination of a late Book published by Doctor Owen, concerning a Sacred Day of Rest. Many Truths therein as to the Morality of a Christian Sabbath assented to. With a Brief Inquiry into his Reasons for the change of it from the seventh day to the first, by way of denial. As also, the Consent of Doctor Heylin and others, touching the time and manner of the change. With an Inquiry into the nature of his assertions about the first and second Covenant. 1671. 4to. Pp. 51.

In opposition to the opinion that *some one day in seven* is all that the Fourth Commandment requires to be set apart, the writer maintains the obligation of the Saturday Sabbath, on the ground that "God himself directly in the letter of the text calls the seventh day the Sabbath-day, giving both the names to one and the self-same day, as all men know that ever read the commandments." (P. 6). He quotes the Second Book of Heylin, whose *History* he finds "full of pregnant proof from end to end, that none of the professed Christian churches in the world, East nor West, did ever own or keep the first day of the week as a Sabbath, nor did any of them judge the Sabbath was transmitted from the seventh to the first day by any Divine institution; nor was it ever by any accounted more than the other holy days were, of Easter, Whitsuntide, Christmas, Saints' days, and the wakes kept for the dedication of churches; nor were any of them set apart but by the church, [and not] with an opinion of their being holy by any command-

ment of God, or Christ, or any apostle, but set apart partly for worship, and partly for recreation," &c. (P. 9.)

Dr Owen's interpretation of Heb. iv. 10, is opposed by Sellers (p. 23); in whose opinion "nothing can be more evident than this, that the chapter treateth of that glorious rest prepared for the people of God in another world, which the unbeliever will fall short of."

Pages 32–51 contain "A Postscript by way of an Appendix, in a brief answer to a late book written by Mr Richard Baxter upon the same subject." Here Sellers treats with contempt and ridicule the opinion of Baxter that Moses legislated only for the Jews and their proselytes (see above, i. 244, and ii. 30): "Can he think God made his law for such a certain plot of ground, and for all that should dwell upon it, and leave the rest of the world lawless? for if it were made for men, what reason can there be wherefore it should not bind one as well as another—Gentile as well as Jew?" and so on. (P. 42.)

If Baxter answered this question, he doubtless re-asserted, as a thing obvious to the unsophisticated common sense of mankind, that a law cannot bind without promulgation—that the Mosaic Law was promulgated only to the Jews—and that the Divine Governor, though he was pleased to impose it on none but his "peculiar people," had not left the Pagans "lawless," but had imposed on them the law of nature, proclaimed through their reason and conscience. It is an observation of Locke, that the mere address, "'Hear, O Israel,' sufficiently restrains the law of Moses only to that people." (*Letter concerning Toleration*, p. 53; ed. 1765). To which Bishop Sherlock adds: "Moses, who best understood the extent of his own commission, says thus to the people of Israel: 'What nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day?' Deut. iv. 8. The holy Psalmist expresses the same sense in these words: 'He showeth his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation; and as for his judgments, they have not known them.' Psal. cxlvii. 19, 20. From all which it is evident that the law of Moses has no claim to our obedience." (Sherlock's *Works*, ed. 1830, vol. i. p. 178, Discourse IX.)

It may here be mentioned that George Walker, in his book on the Sabbath (No. 106; above, i. 207), not content with asserting, as many others have done, the obligatoriness of the law of Moses on such of the Gentiles as *came to the knowledge of it*, goes so far as to maintain that even *ignorance* of that law "doth not exempt Pagans from the duty of keeping a weekly Sabbath." For this opinion he assigns the "plain reasons" following:—

"First, Because they had means from Adam and their first progenitors to know the law; for when the earth was divided into several nations and countries, the fathers and first founders of every nation did know that God had, in sanctifying the seventh day, given this commandment to our first parents and the seed in

their loins: But they by wilful neglect of this duty brought the law into oblivion, and their children rejoicing to follow their licentious ways, and to put far from them all thoughts of this duty and all regard of this law, became wilfully ignorant of God's will, yea, they scorn to hearken to God's word if it be brought unto them.

"Secondly, No ignorance which is not invincible, but might be avoided by due care and diligence, can exempt a man from any duty which God hath commanded all mankind to perform. Our Saviour tells us that he which fails of his duty out of simple ignorance, and doth not his Lord's will because he knew it not, shall be punished and beaten, though with fewer stripes.* Because God is the Lord of all, every man ought to inquire after and learn his will: and therefore heathen people, though they know not this law, shall be beaten for neglect of this duty, because they ought to know God, and to learn his will, who gives them life, breath, and all things. . . .

"Thirdly, All mankind, even the most barbarous and savage nations, as they have their being, and all gifts of nature, from God's creating hand and power; so they have all these things continued unto them by the mediation of Christ. . . . Now they who partake the benefit of Christ, the blessed seed promised to Adam, they are bound to the duty which God requires in thankfulness for it, and for a continual commemoration thereof. Therefore all mankind, even the most barbarous, are bound to the duty of keeping an holy Sabbath weekly, though they do not know that which binds them to it and leads them to the performance thereof.

"Fourthly, God's blessing a seventh day, and sanctifying it by his commandment given to our first parents, is as easily to be learned and known, and kept in memory, as many other things of less moment, which heathen infidels do learn and know, and keep in memory for worldly respects. As for example, to measure the times of the world by years, and years by months, and months by weeks, and weeks by seven days, this because the heathen find to be very commodious for worldly and civil respects, therefore they are careful to learn and remember it and all such things. And it is as easy and as possible to learn and know God's law concerning a weekly Sabbath; and they would and might learn it if they were as careful for their souls, and to serve God, as they are for their life, and to serve their own lusts and this world. And if they would travel, and send abroad into far countries to learn heavenly knowledge and holy behaviour, as diligently as they do to learn human knowledge and worldly wisdom, art and skill, they could not be ignorant of God's law concerning the weekly Sabbath. But they refuse to learn this, as they do to learn true religion, and shut their eyes against it, as they do against the knowledge of Christ."† (Pp. 107, 108.)

* But see, on the other hand, 1 Tim. i. 13.

† The following is the full title of Walker's book, which I have had an opportunity of seeing since the article No. 106 was printed:—

Sherlock's answer to all such reasoning is brief and pithy: "If God intends a law for the use of the world, he is obliged, if I may use the expression, to *publish* the law to the world." (*Works*, i. 178.)

162. YOUNG, THOMAS, D.D. (*see No.* 99.)—The Lord's Day: or a Succinct Narration compiled out of the Testimonies of Holy Scripture and the reverend ancient Fathers; and divided into two Books. In the former whereof is declared, that the observation of the Lord's Day was from the apostles, and by the Christian Church solemnized in a continual series; that its Institution was Divine; and what things do hinder its solemnity. In the latter is shown, in what things its sanctification doth consist. In both which also several Ecclesiastical Antiquities, not unworthy to be known, are explained. Lately translated out of the Latin. Lond. 1672.

This is a translation of Dr Young's Latin treatise, No. 99 (vol. i. p. 193). It has a preface by Richard Baxter, in which he says that the declaration in his own late work of his opinion of the singular weight and worth of this book (see above, p. 29) had occasioned many to inquire after it, and a worthy knight who had this translation by him to be willing to publish it. "The author," adds Baxter, "was a man eminent in his time for great learning, judgment, piety, humility, but especially for his acquaintance with the writings of the ancient teachers of the churches, and the doctrine and practice of former ages." It is, however, to be regretted

"The Doctrine of the Holy Weekly Sabbath: wherein is discovered the true ground and the time of the first institution, the nature of the law binding man to keep and sanctify it, and the necessity, as of the observation of it on the seventh and last day of the week in the time of the Old Testament, so of the removing of it to the first day now under the Gospel. Also, besides the special duties necessarily required for the due sanctification thereof, these two profitable points are proved by demonstration out of God's Word: First, that the Lord Christ, God and Man, is the Lord of the Sabbath, on whom the Sabbath was first founded, and by whom it was changed from the last to the first day of the week, and is on that day unchangeably to be kept by all true Christians until they come to the eternal rest in heaven after the general resurrection: Secondly, That the faithful under the Gospel are as necessarily bound to keep the weekly Sabbath of the Lord's Day by virtue of the Fourth Commandment, as the Fathers under the Law were bound to keep the seventh day. Delivered in divers sermons by George Walker, B.D., and Pastor of St John Evangelist's Church in London." Lond. 1641. 4to. Pp. 170.

The peculiarity of his doctrine is, that "the true ground of the Sabbath is God's blessing of the seventh day with the promise of Christ, and sanctifying it by shedding his spirit on our first parents and giving them faith to believe in Christ the blessed seed."

that the spuriousness of some important passages in Ignatius and others, relied on by Dr Young, had not been discovered when he wrote.

The full title of the original work (which I have lately found in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin) is, "Dies Dominica; sive Succincta Narratio ex S. Scripturarum et venerandæ antiquitatis Patrum testimoniis concinnata, et duobus libris distincta: Quorum priori, Diei Dominicæ observationem ab ipsis Apostolis, Ecclesiaque Christiana continua serie solennem fuisse habitam, ejus institutionem fuisse divinam, et quæ ejus solennitatem impediant, declaratur: Posteriori vero, in quibus ejus sanctificatio consistat ostenditur. In quibus etiam variæ Ecclesiasticæ Antiquitates cognitu non indignæ explicantur. Anno 1639." 4to. Pp. 132. The title-page is prudently anonymous, and the dedication is signed "THEOPHILUS PHILO-KURIACES *Loncardiensis*."

163. BAMPFIELD, FRANCIS.—The Judgment of Mr Francis Bampfield, late Minister of Sherborne in Dorsetshire, for the Observation of the Jewish or seventh-day Sabbath; with his Reasons and Scriptures for the same: Sent in a Letter to Mr Ben of Dorchester. Together with Mr Ben's sober Answer to the same; and a Vindication of the Christian Sabbath against the Jewish. Published for the satisfaction of divers friends in the West of England. Lond. 1672. 12mo. Pp. 86.

Bampfield's portion of the volume occupies but eleven pages, the rest being filled by the sober answer of Mr Ben. The latter denies his antagonist's assumption that the last day of seven in every week, and the Sabbath-day, that is (as Bampfield explains it) "the day of holy rest of God's appointment for his solemn worship in every week," are and must be terms convertible, and that the last of seven in every week, as it was at first, so is now, and must continue to the end of the world to be the only day for that purpose. (P. 16.) God's example at the creation, Mr Ben holds to be available only to show the duty of resting on a stated day after six days' labour; and in the Fourth Commandment he finds but a law for the same extent of duty. (P. 29, *et seq.*) To the objection, that then, as no change by Divine authority is recorded in Scripture, the Christian Sabbath may be *any* day of the week, he replies, that "what day, and even above all other days, God honours with his most eminent work, is to be the day of holy rest unto God."

164. HOMES, NATHANAEL, D.D.—An Essay concerning the Sabbath; or the Sabbath-day's Rest from Con-

troversy. Wherein is asserted that our Christian Sabbath, Lord's Day, or Sunday, is the very same day of the week which was anciently observed by the Jews and Gentiles for the solemn day of their solemn weekly worship, before Israel's coming out of Egypt, and after that by the Gentiles. Prefaced with an Introduction thereunto, touching the true meaning of Gen. ii. 2, 3. Lond. 1673. 24mo. Pp. 141.

It had been held by Mede that there is no evidence in Scripture that the Jewish Sabbath-day was the seventh in order from the creation; and he had further stated reasons for concluding, that if the Israelites observed a Sabbath in the desert before the raining of manna, they did so on a different day of the week from that which was afterwards their Sabbath. (See above, i. 155.) Advancing a step further in the same direction, Dr Homes conceives that this different day was Sunday; or rather, that the Saturday of the Jews was substantially the same day, though differently named, with the Sunday of the Patriarchs and Gentiles.

After contending, in an Introduction of 41 pages, for the appointment of the Sabbath at the creation (in opposition to Gomarus and Heylin, who regarded Gen. ii. 2, 3 as proleptical), he expounds the three names of the Christian Sabbath, and then proceeds to prove the thesis expressed in his title-page. The *natural day*, he observes, consists of twenty-four hours, counted either from sunrise to sunrise or from sunset to sunset, and hence called the horizontal day. It is divided into two parts—the *artificial day*, or daylight, and the period of darkness called *night*. The artificial day, he thinks, was anciently, before Israel's going out of Egypt, counted the beginning or former part of the natural day, and the night its latter part; this he gathers from Gen. i. 16, 17, 18; vii. 4, 12; viii. 22; xix. 34; xxvi. 24; xxxi. 42; Numb. xxxiii. 3; 1 Sam. xix. 11; Matt. vi. 34; James iv. 13, 14. And even *after* the exodus, "the Jews (mentioned in Scripture) did commonly," says he, "account the artificial day of daylight to be the former part of the day in respect of their civil affairs (Exod. xiii. 21, 22; Lev. viii. 35)." His inference, that at the exodus the night was made (except as just noticed) the former part of the natural day, is deduced from the circumstance, that a never-to-be-forgotten memorial is solemnly put upon that night wherein Israel marched out of Egypt (Exod. xii. 42, "It is a night to be much observed unto the Lord for bringing them out from the land of Egypt: this is that night of the Lord to be observed of all the children of Israel in their generations"); and from the command afterwards given them to celebrate the Sabbath "from evening to evening" (Lev. xxiii. 32), obedience to which command of course led them to begin and end thus their week-days also, in order to make the seventh

day proportionable to their six of labour.* From this time also their year had a new beginning (Exod. xii. 2; xxiii. 16; xxxiv. 22); so that although in respect of their civil affairs they began their year, month, and day, as they did before the exodus, yet in the new ecclesiastical year they began their day at sunset, and reckoned the evening to be the former part of the day. That the Jewish artificial day of daylight consisted of twelve hours is deduced by him from Acts ii. 15, and Matt. xxvii. 45. Now, he proceeds, as Moses put back the account, to begin the Sabbath-day at the evening before, namely from six o'clock in the evening wherein Israel departed from Egypt, to continue to six o'clock in the evening of the next ensuing day,—"so Christ re-assumed and brought forward all that day-light, and put it to the next day, with which [day-light],† together with the night following, he made a new distinct day, by rising early in the morning of that new-made day; having put an end to the Jewish Sabbath; Matt. xxviii. 1: 'in the *end* of the Sabbath' (Christ then put an end to the Jewish Sabbath) 'when it began ἐπιφωσκειν, to dawn' with some light 'towards the *first day* of the week;' in which rising Christ ceased (as learned Weems notes, according to Heb. iv. 10) 'from his own works, as God did from his.'" (P. 60.) To the objection that Gen. i. 5, &c., indicates that from the beginning the artificial night was set before the artificial day as part of the natural day, he answers that the days there mentioned were not natural but creational days, peculiar to the creation, and neither measured out by the sun (which was not created till the fourth), nor differing, as natural days do, in the times of their beginnings and endings, at different parts of the earth. And Moses having penned the book of Genesis after the exodus, it would have seemed, had he written "The morning and the evening were the first day," &c., that he "disliked the said change appointed by God as aforesaid, of making the evening the beginning of each day after their coming out of Egypt." (P. 70.)

The reasons assigned by Dr Homes why the Jews were to change the beginning of the day, and so, as he thinks, the day itself from Sunday to Saturday, are—first, that a memorial of their deliverance out of Egypt might be established; and secondly, that as the heathens dedicated the former day to the Sun, and worshipped that luminary on it as a god, there was an evident expediency in shifting the Jewish day of worship to another. In endeavouring to prove that the Gentiles *did* worship the Sun on the first day of the week, he assumes it as highly probable that the Patriarchs both before and after the Flood observed that day in honour of the Creator of "that wonderful frame of heaven, and in it that transcendent shining planet the Sun;" this day being chosen by them in imitation of his resting on the seventh day of the creation, "which is urged in the Fourth Commandment as to a seventh-day Sabbath, if not to *the*

* The command in Lev. xxiii. 32, refers only to the annual day of atonement, though it has generally been applied to the weekly Sabbath.

† It is only by interpolating this word that I can make the passage intelligible.

seventh-day Sabbath which we now observe as our Lord's Day. . . . . The Patriarchs that were before the Flood no doubt called and accounted God to be their Sun in a figurative sense, as the Patriarchs that were after the Flood, and their succeeding generations, did likewise (Numb. vi. 25; Deut. xxxiii. 1, 2; Psal. viii.; xxxi. 16; lxvii. 1; lxxxiv. 11; Mal. iv. 2). . . . . Now, as 'tis true that the pious Patriarchs of old, in a figurative sense calling and accounting God to be as their Sun, did call and account their weekly solemn day of their solemn worship of him by the name of *Sunday*, or *Sun's day*, or *Day of the Sun;* so it is as true that idolatrous heathen, of very ancient times, and downward, in imitation of the Jews' worshipping the true God, their metaphorical Sun, did, on the said Sunday, worship the material and natural Sun, and upon that account called it their *Sunday*, or *Day of the Sun.*" But it is not imaginable that those who worshipped the whole host of heaven would dedicate any other day to their greatest god, the Sun, than the day which the Patriarchs before the Flood dedicated to the Creator of the Sun; "and moreover, seeing the idolaters assigned to every of their seven planet-gods one of the seven days in the week, no considering sober man can think otherwise but that they would dedicate and celebrate to their greatest god, the Sun (whom they called God of gods and Lord of lords), the day formerly observed and celebrated to the great and true God of heaven and earth, rather than to the Moon or Mercury, or other their inferior gods." (Pp. 74–82.)

He goes on to adduce evidence for the proposition that the Sun was worshipped by the heathen Gentiles in all countries and generations of old (pp. 83–93); after which he undertakes to prove "that our Sunday or Lord's Day was, with the heathen Gentiles, the seventh day of the week, for their solemn day of worship." This he upholds "partly by reason, and partly by quotation of learned authors, both Christians and heathens." On the ground of *reason*, it is argued that, doubtless, Adam "learned, from the standard of God's working six days and resting the seventh, what was a day, a week, and the boundary thereof, and thereby measured out the time of his life, and so it was kept, and left upon record for after ages. Months and years, among several nations, have much varied; but never was the week counted to be more or less than seven days with any people." The *authors* quoted are Homer and the other Greek poets formerly referred to (see above, vol. i. pp. 113, 221), with Josephus and Philo (vol. i. pp. 116, 117, 225), and several modern writers, the strongest assertion by whom is that of Aug. Steuchius, who, "affirmeth the seventh day to have been venerable and sacred in all ages among all nations." Now, says Homes, this veneration of the ancient Gentiles for the Sunday, they could not have from the Books of Moses; for these were not translated into Greek till many centuries after Homer, and the early Jews thought it a profaning of Moses's writings to communicate them to the heathens. "Therefore it must needs follow that the heathen Gentiles had that honourable opinion and spake so laud-

ably of the Sunday, by very ancient successive tradition amongst themselves. Now this seventh day, of which they so well thought and spake, could not be the Jews' Saturday Sabbath; for the heathen utterly disliked it, and disdainfully counted it an innovation brought in by Moses, and therefore the poets would commonly have one lash or another at it, and never spoke honourably of it. Therefore it must be the ancient Sunday (before Moses's time, and after that among the heathen,) that was by the heathens honoured as the seventh day of the week, the high day of their prime and solemn worship every week." In answer to those who deny that the Gentiles venerated any seventh day but the seventh of the month, which, among some at least, was sacred to Apollo or the Sun (see above, i. 118), Dr Homes refers to the application made of some passages in the Greek poets by Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius to the seventh day of the *week*, and denies the existence of any mention at all of the seventh day of the month in the Greek calendar. In the same chapter, a superfluity of evidence is heaped up to show that the "Sunday" of the Gentiles was the "Lord's Day" of the early Christians. (Pp. 94–108.)

From the whole discussion it is concluded:—

"1. That the morality of the Fourth Commandment is stamped, impressed, and fixed, rather on the Christians' Sunday, Sabbath-day, Seventh-day, or First-day, than upon the Jews' Saturday-Sabbath.

"2. That the Jews' artificial Sabbath-day of daylight, and the Christians' artificial Sabbath-day of daylight, were in the same horizon, and materially as to daylight the very same, at the very first change of the Sabbath, Exod. xii. 42. . . They are numerically the same day, although variously named; viz., the *seventh day*, because it followed our six days' labour; and the *first day*, because the chief day of the week from Adam to us, and the chief day of Christ agitating on earth for our salvation, viz., the day of his triumphant resurrection, which, in the letter of the original, is not called 'the first day of the week,' but *μία σαββάτου* and *σαββάτων* (Mark xvi. 2; John xx. 1; 1 Cor. xvi. 2.) . . . . And,

"3. That both Sabbath-days—the Jews' and ours—upon several accounts are the same." (Pp. 116–118.)

In regard to the first of these conclusions: The resurrection of Christ on Sunday, and "his several appearances on that day of the week to his apostles at their devotions," together with the approval with which the apostles regarded the churches' meetings on that day, are held to have "new stampt" the original Sabbath-day, which, because it could plead prescription and seniority, had never become void, and therefore needed no formal re-establishment.

The second and most important conclusion is advocated thus:—"If we grant what is before undeniably proved, that both the Jews and Gentiles, before the change of the Sabbath, observed our Sunday, whose daylight began, both with Jew and Gentile, at sunrising; and at the institution of that change of the Sabbath, God commanded the Jews to take into their Sabbath the next preceding

evening; then either we must say the Jews' Sabbath began the evening next *afore* our Sabbath-day-light began, or else that the Jews' Sabbath began at the evening *after* our Sabbath-day-light began. If we say *after*, then one whole day is lost in the computation of time. If we say *afore*, then we have that we contend for." (Pp. 133.)

Thirdly; the several respects in which the Jewish and Christian Sabbath-days are the same are these: 1. They are the same *materially*, as to daylight; 2. They are the same *reputatively*, *i.e.*, they are reputed and esteemed the same day of the week in number, both Jews and Christians keeping their Sabbath on the same day of the week, viz., the seventh; and "the reason why the seventh day of the week with the Jews comes to be almost a day sooner than it doth with the Christians is, because the Jews began their week near a day sooner than they did formerly before the change of it at their coming out of Egypt, and sooner than the heathen Gentiles did and the Christians now do." 3. Both Sabbath-days are the same *boundarily*, each being bounded by six days' labour. "The Sabbath must either relate to the six days of God's work of creation, or to the six days of man's labour in his vocation. Now it cannot relate to the six days of God's work of creation, and so to the day of God's rest; for then, either the day of God's rest and the Jews' Sabbath must be the same, beginning in all places at sunsetting, wherever the Jews did or ought to observe their Sabbath—which cannot be, except the earth were all a flat (and not a round globe), as we see by sense, both on the globe and on the hills and mountains of the earth, how their roundness makes the day begin successively over the whole earth: Or else the day of God's rest did at the first, and still doth begin in this computation of a seventh, sooner in some places than in other; and so first at one particular place, whiles it was nowhere else the day of God's rest; either of which are so against sense and reason, that no understanding man can rationally imagine it. Therefore the bounding and measuring out of the Sabbath must relate to the six days of man's labour in his vocation, as it is directed in the Fourth Commandment; immediately after which six days of our labour follows the seventh day for rest. So that in this respect, also, the Jews' Sabbath and our Sabbath are the same." (Pp. 137–139).

The main purpose of Dr Homes appears to have been to satisfy the Saturday-Sabbatarians (or Seventh-day Baptists) that the "seventh day" of the Fourth Commandment is the very day which other Christians observe, and so to "bring them out of that discomfort and those encumbrances that attend the practice of their erroneous opinion." It is unlikely, however, that many converts were made by a treatise where the weight of the evidence adduced is so remarkably small in proportion to the magnitude and multiplicity of the conclusions. We are totally ignorant which half of the natural day was considered by the patriarchs to be the former half, and have just as little information about changes of reckoning at

Israel's departure from Egypt, and at the resurrection of Christ. Had any such changes been made, would they not have been intelligibly recorded? In regard to the worship of the Sun, we know that some early Gentile nations (and the Jews also, for a long time after Moses) were greatly addicted to it; but whether the first, or any, day of the week was set apart for its performance, and whether, in early times (as, doubtless, in the second century of the Christian era), the first day of the week was called *Sunday*, we are wholly in the dark. The notion that the early Gentiles regarded the seventh or other day of the week as holy, has already been shown to need better evidence than any yet adduced for it. (See vol. i., p. 113.) In deciding against the relation of the Sabbath to the six days of God's work, Dr Homes overlooks a kind of relation which, I presume, is recognised by the Westminster divines where they teach that "from the beginning of the world to the resurection of Christ, God appointed the seventh day of the week to be the weekly Sabbath," (above, i. 233): As God rested on *the seventh day of the week* of creation, so did the Jew rest on what was *the seventh day of the week* in his calendar where he lived; and this without his being concerned to know whether, at the moment when *his* day began, the sun was setting also in the other parts of the earth.

Of all the arguments directed by Dr Homes against the Seventh-day Baptists, certainly the *least* effective is his interpretation of the words, "in the end of the Sabbath."

The general idea, however, that the Sabbath-day was originally Sunday, but was shifted to Saturday at the giving of the Law, and came back to Sunday at the resurrection of Christ, has continued to have advocates down to the present time. The works of Chafie (1692), Smith (1694), Bedford (1730), Kennicott (1747), and Dr Samuel Lee, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge (1833), are all in favour of this opinion; and a recent anonymous writer conceives it to be "fully proved" by appealing to the bare assertion of some unnamed Jewish Rabbis, that the primeval Sabbath-day was altered at the exodus, and would at the coming of the Messiah be restored to its original day! (*Sunday the Sabbath-day.* By a Believing Israelite. Edin. 1857. P. 20.) If any of the Rabbis have so expressed themselves, their words may have suggested to Dr Homes or others the theory now under consideration. Bishop Horsley, in his 23d Sermon, pronounces it to be "a mere conjecture, of which the sacred history affords neither proof nor confutation."

If the conjecture is true, the primeval Sabbath was *superseded* by that of Moses; if erroneous, was *absorbed* by it. "I marvel much," says Sir William Domville, "whether those Sabbatarians who think that a new seventh day was appointed for the Mosaic Sabbath, ever ask themselves the question, What in that case became of the old seventh day? They insist upon it, and it is of the very essence of their tenet in regard to a creation Sabbath, that God blessed and sanctified not only the seventh day in which he rested, but also every succeeding seventh day. Every seventh day,

therefore, in regular recurrence from that of the creation to the time of Moses, a period of 2500 years, continued to be blessed and sanctified; but, in the case supposed, it follows, that at the end of that period, this seventh day was thenceforth desecrated, deprived of its holy nature, and reduced to the level of an ordinary day, in deference to the new day designed for the Mosaic Sabbath. Such a course of Providence,—first consecrating a particular day of the week for one purpose, and afterwards unconsecrating it for another purpose,—appears utterly incredible, unless upon irresistible evidence, which there is not, that such, nevertheless, was the fact." (*The Sabbath*, &c., ii. 126.)

165. CLEADON, THOMAS, *Rector of Radwinter, Essex.*—A Serious and Brief Discourse touching the Sabbath Day. Lond. 1674. 4to. (First printed in 1665.)

166. CASE, THOMAS, *an eminent English nonconformist divine* (*died* 1680).—Of Sabbath Sanctification: a Sermon on Isa. lviii. 13, 14. 1674. 4to.

167. MILTON, JOHN, *an English poet of the first rank, theologian, and political writer* (*born* 1608; *died* 1674).—De Doctrinâ Christianâ, ex Sacris duntaxat Libris petita, Disquisitionum Libri duo posthumi, quos ex schedis manuscriptis deprompsit, et typis mandari primus curavit, Carolus Ricardus Sumner, A.M. Cantab. 1825. 4to.—A Treatise on Christian Doctrine, compiled from the Holy Scriptures alone. Translated from the Original by Charles R. Sumner, M.A., Librarian and Historiographer to His Majesty, and Prebendary of Canterbury. Camb. 1825. 4to.

This work, which Milton was known to have written, lay undiscovered in manuscript till 1823, when it was found in the State Paper Office at London, by Mr Lemon, the deputy-keeper. By command of George IV. it was edited and translated by Mr Sumner (now Dr Sumner, Bishop of Winchester); and from a document subsequently discovered, we learn that in 1675 Milton's friend Skinner had sent the manuscript to Daniel Elzevir of Amsterdam to be printed, but that the printer declined, having found in it many things which, in his opinion, had better be suppressed than divulged.

The translation was reprinted at Boston, U. S., in 2 vols. 8vo., 1825; and a revised edition of it is contained in the fourth and fifth volumes of Mr J. A. St John's edition of the *Prose Works* of Milton (Lond. 1853, post 8vo; *Bohn's Standard Library*).

Milton's opinions about the Sabbath are to be found in Book I. ch. x., "Of the special Government of Man before the Fall, including the Institutions of the Sabbath and of Marriage;" and in Book II. ch. vii., "On the Time for Divine Worship; wherein are considered the Sabbath, Lord's Day, and Festivals" (Mr St John's ed., iv. 220-224; v. 64-74). The entire passages are here subjoined:—

"With regard to the Sabbath, it is clear that God hallowed it to himself, and dedicated it to rest, in remembrance of the consummation of his work, Gen. ii. 2, 3; Exod. xxxi. 17. Whether its institution was ever made known to Adam, or whether any commandment relative to its observance was given previous to the delivery of the law on Mount Sinai, much less whether any such was given before the fall of man, cannot be ascertained, Scripture being silent on the subject. The most probable supposition is, that Moses, who seems to have written the book of Genesis much later than the promulgation of the law, inserted this sentence from the Fourth Commandment, into what appeared a suitable place for it; where an opportunity was afforded for reminding the Israelites, by a natural and easy transition, of the reason assigned by God, many ages after the event itself, for his command with regard to the observance of the Sabbath by the covenanted people. An instance of a similar insertion occurs Exod. xvi. 33, 34. 'Moses said unto Aaron, Take a pot and put an omer full of manna therein . . . so Aaron laid it up;' which, however, did not take place till long afterwards. The injunction respecting the celebration of the Sabbath in the wilderness, Exod. xvi., a short time previous to the delivery of the law, namely, that no one should go out to gather manna on the seventh morning, because God had said that he would not rain it from heaven on that day, seems rather to have been intended as a preparatory notice, the groundwork, as it were, of a law for the Israelites, to be delivered shortly afterwards in a clearer manner; they having been previously ignorant of the mode of observing the Sabbath. Compare ver. 5 with ver. 22–30. For the rulers of the congregation, who ought to have been better acquainted than the rest with the commandment of the Sabbath, if any such institution then existed, wondered why the people gathered twice as much on the sixth day, and appealed to Moses; who then, as if announcing something new, proclaimed to them that the morrow would be the Sabbath. After which, as if he had already related in what manner the Sabbath was for the first time observed, he proceeds, ver. 30, 'so the people rested on the seventh day.'

"That the Israelites had not so much as heard of the Sabbath before this time, seems to be confirmed by several passages of the prophets. Ezek. xx. 10–12: 'I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness; and I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments . . . moreover also I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am Jehovah that sanctify them.'

Neh. ix. 13, 14: 'thou camest down also upon mount Sinai . . . and gavest them right judgments . . . and madest known unto them thy holy sabbath, and commandedst them precepts, statutes and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant.' This subject, however, will come again under discussion." (Book I. ch. x.)

Accordingly, in Book II. ch. vii., he resumes it as follows:—

"Thus far of the parts of divine worship. We are now to consider its circumstances.

"The circumstances of worship are the same as of all things natural, place and time.

"Public worship, previously to the law of Moses, was not confined to any definite place: under the law it took place partly in the synagogues and partly in the temple; under the gospel any convenient place is proper. John iv. 21, 23: 'Ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father; but the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth;' as Malachi had also prophesied, i. 11: 'in every place incense shall be offered unto my name.'

"With regard to the time of public worship, what this was before the law does not appear. Under the law it was the Sabbath, that is, the seventh day, which was consecrated to God from the beginning of the world, Gen. ii. 2, 3, but which (as stated in Book I. chap. x.) was not, so far as we can learn, observed, or commanded to be observed, till the second month of the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, Exod. xvi. 1, 23, 25, 29, when it was enforced with severe prohibitions: ver. 23, 'To-morrow is the rest of the holy sabbath unto Jehovah; bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that which ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning.' xx. 8, &c., 'Remember the sabbath-day, to keep it holy;' that is, remember it according to the previous commandment in the sixteenth chapter, referred to above; or it may be an emphatic manner of admonition. [Here Milton adds quotations from Exod. xxxi. 14; xxxiv. 21; xxxv. 2, 3; Lev. xxiii. 3; Numb. xv. 32; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 20, 21; Jer. xvii. 21, 22; Neh. x. 31; xiii. 15, &c.]

"The command to observe the Sabbath was given to the Israelites for a variety of reasons, mostly peculiar to themselves, and which are recorded in different parts of the Mosaic law. First, as a memorial of God's having completed the work of creation on the seventh day. Exod. xx. 11; xxxi. 15-17: 'wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath throughout their generations for a perpetual covenant . . . for in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed.' Here, although the reason given for the celebration of the Sabbath applies equally to all other nations, the Israelites alone are enjoined to observe it; as is also the case with the command to abstain from creeping things, Lev. xi. 44: 'ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be holy, for I am holy; neither shall ye defile yourselves with any manner of creeping thing

that creepeth upon the earth;' with the law against disfiguring the body, and other similar commands, Deut. xiv. 1, &c., 'ye are the children of God;' for the reasons on which these precepts are founded apply equally to believers in general, and to all ages, although the precepts themselves are no longer obligatory. This has been remarked by our countryman Ames.* 'Non est catholicæ veritatis illa regula interpretandi scripturas quæ tradi solet a quibusdam, officia illa omnia esse moralia et immutabilia quæ rationes morales et immutabiles habent sibi annexas; nisi sic intelligatur ut illa officia sequantur ex illis rationibus, nullo singulari Dei præcepto intercedente.' (Ames, *Medull. Theol.* lib. ii. c. 13.) This, however, cannot be said either of the precepts above mentioned, or of the Sabbath.

"Secondly, because God was pleased by this distinguishing mark to separate the Israelites from other nations. Exod. xxxi. 13, &c.: 'it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am Jehovah that doth sanctify you; ye shall keep the sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you.' Ezek. xx. 12: 'to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am Jehovah that sanctify them.' See also ver. 20.

"Thirdly, that the slaves and cattle might enjoy a respite from labour. Exod. xxiii. 12: 'that thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thine handmaid and the stranger may be refreshed.' Deut. v. 12, 14: 'keep the sabbath-day . . . that thy manservant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou.' This reason applies only where servants are in a state of slavery, and subject to severe labour; the condition of hired servants, who are now generally employed, being much easier than that of purchased slaves in old time.

"Fourthly, in remembrance of their liberation from Egypt. Deut. v. 15: 'remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that Jehovah thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm; therefore Jehovah thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath-day.'

* "Dr William Ames, a Puritan divine in the time of James and Charles the First, and Professor of Divinity in the University of Franeker, a town of the Netherlands, in Friesland. It was partly from the work quoted above, and partly from *The Abridgement of Christian Divinitie* by Wollebius, that Milton, according to Phillips, compiled for the use of his pupils a system of Divinity, which they wrote on Sundays at his dictation. An English translation of Ames's treatise was published by order of the House of Commons in 1642, under the title of *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity, drawne out of the Holy Scriptures and the Interpreters thereof, and brought into method.* . . . The translation is very badly executed, as the version of the passage quoted in the text will show. 'That rule, therefore, of interpreting the Scriptures which is wont to be delivered by some, is not universally true: that all those duties [are] morall and immutable, which have morall and immutable reasons joyned to them, except it be thus understood, that those duties doe follow upon those reasons, no special command coming betweene.'" (*Note by Sumner.*) Ames (Lat. *Amesius*), who died in 1633, wrote a book *De Origine Sabbati et Die Dominico.* Amst. 1658, 12mo.

"Fifthly, as a shadow or type of things to come. Col. ii. 16, 17: 'in respect of an holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-days; which are a shadow of things to come: but the body is of Christ.' Of what things to come the sabbaths are a shadow, we are taught, Heb. iv. 9, 10, namely, of that sabbatical rest or eternal peace in heaven, of which all believers are commanded to strive to be partakers through faith and obedience, following the example of Christ.

"Works of charity and mercy were not forbidden on the Sabbath, upon the authority of Christ himself. Mark ii. 27: 'the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath.' iii. 4: 'is it lawful to do good on the sabbath-days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill?' Luke xiii. 15, 16: 'doth not each one of you on the sabbath loose his ox—? . . . ought not this woman to be loosed from this bond on the sabbath-day?' xiv. 5: 'which of you shall have an ox or an ass fallen into a pit,' &c. John vii. 23: 'are ye angry at me because I have made a man every whit whole on the sabbath-day?' Even for a man to take up his bed, ver. 11, although consonant to the spirit of the law, was contrary to its letter, Jer. xvii. 21, 22.

"Since then the Sabbath was originally an ordinance of the Mosaic law, imposed on the Israelites alone, and that for the express purpose of distinguishing them from other nations, it follows that, if (as was shown in the former book) those who live under the gospel are emancipated from the ordinances of the law in general, least of all can they be considered as bound by that of the Sabbath, the distinction being abolished which was the special cause of its institution. It was for asserting this in precept, and enforcing it by example, that Christ incurred the heavy censure of the Pharisees, John ix. 16, 'this man is not of God, because he keepeth not the sabbath-day.' Gal. iv. 9, 10; 'how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? ye observe days, and months, and times, and years.' Col. ii. 16, 17: 'let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-days.' If it be contended, that it is only the septennial, and not the seventh-day sabbath which is said by St Paul to be abrogated, I reply, first, that no exception is here made; and, secondly, that it may as well be contended that baptism is not meant, Heb. vi. 2, on account of the plural noun *baptisms*. Besides, it is certain that the words *sabbath* and *sabbaths* are used indiscriminately of the seventh day, Exod. xxxi. 13, 14; Isa. lvi. 2, 4, 6. Whoever, therefore, denies that under the words of the apostle, 'in respect of an holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-days,' the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is comprehended, may as well deny that it is spoken of 2 Chron. ii. 4, or viii. 13, or xxxi. 3, from which passages the words of St Paul seem to be taken.

"The law of the Sabbath being thus repealed, that no particular day of worship has been appointed in its place, is evident from the

same apostle, Rom. xiv. 5, 'one man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike: let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.' For since, as was observed above, no particular place is designated under the gospel for the public worship of God, there seems no reason why time, the other circumstance of worship, should be more defined. If Paul had not intended to intimate the abolition of all sabbaths whatever, and of all sanctification of one day above another, he would not have added in the following verse, 'he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it.' For how does he *not regard the day to the Lord*, if there be any commandment still in force by which a particular day, whether the Sabbath or any other, is to be observed?

"It remains to be seen on what they ground their opinion, who maintain that the Lord's Day is to be observed as set apart for public worship by divine institution, in the nature of a new sabbath. It is urged, first, that God rested on the seventh day. This is true; and with reason, inasmuch as he had finished a great work, the creation of heaven and earth: if then we are bound to imitate him in his rest, without any command to that effect (and none has yet been produced), we are equally bound to imitate his work, according to the fable of Prometheus of old; for rest implies previous labour. They rejoin, that God hallowed that day. Doubtless he hallowed it, as touching himself, for 'on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed,' Exod. xxxi. 17, but not as touching us, unless he had added an express commandment to that effect; for it is by the precepts, not by the example, even of God himself that we are bound. They affirm again, that the sabbath was observed previously to the Mosaic law. This is asserted with more confidence than probability; even if it were so, however (a point as to which we are altogether ignorant), it is equally certain that sacrificial rites, and distinctions between things clean and unclean, and other similar observances, were in force during the same period, which nevertheless are not classed among moral duties.

"They urge, however, that the celebration of the Sabbath was subsequently ordained by the Fourth Commandment. This is true, as regards the seventh day; but how does this apply to the first day? If, on the plea of a divine command, they impose upon us the observance of a particular day, how do they presume, without the authority of a divine command, to substitute another day in its place? or in other words to pronounce, that not merely the seventh day, which was appointed for the observation of the Israelites alone, but any one of the seven may, even on the authority of the Fourth Commandment itself, be kept holy; and that this is to be accounted an article of moral duty among all nations.

"In the first place, I do not see how this assertion can be established, for it is impossible to extort such a sense from the words of the commandment; seeing that the reason for which the command itself was originally given, namely, as a memorial of God's having rested from the creation of the world, cannot be transferred

from the seventh day to the first; nor can any new motive be substituted in its place, whether the resurrection of our Lord or any other, without the sanction of a divine commandment. Since then it is evident from more than one passage of Scripture, that the original Sabbath is abrogated, and since we are nowhere told that it has been transferred from one day to another, nor is any reason given why it should be so transferred, the Church, when she sanctioned a change in this matter, evinced, not her obedience to God's command (inasmuch as the command existed no longer), but her own rightful liberty; for in any other view it can only be termed folly. To make any change whatever in a commandment of God, whether we believe that commandment to be still in force or not, is equally dangerous, and equally reprehensible; inasmuch as in so doing we are either annulling what is not yet repealed, or re-enacting what is obsolete. It ought also to be shown what essential principle of morality is involved in the number seven; and why, when released from the obligation of the Sabbath, we should still be bound to respect a particular number possessing no inherent virtue or efficacy. The only moral sabbatical rest which remains for us under the gospel, is spiritual and eternal, pertaining to another life rather than the present. Heb. iv. 9-11: 'There remaineth, therefore, a rest to the people of God; for he that hath entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his; let us labour, therefore, to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief.' If, then, the commandment of the Sabbath was given to those alone whom God had *brought out of the land of Egypt, and out of the house of bondage*, it is evidently inapplicable to us as Christians; or if, as is contended, it is applicable to us inasmuch as we have been brought out of the slavery of a spiritual Egypt, the Sabbath ought to be such as the deliverance, spiritual and evangelical, not bodily and legal; above all, it ought to be a voluntary, not a constrained observance, lest we should be merely substituting one Egyptian bondage for another; for the Spirit cannot be forced. To contend therefore that what, under the new dispensation, ought to be our daily employment, has been enjoined as the business of the Sabbath exclusively, is to disparage the gospel worship, and to frustrate rather than enforce the commandments of God.

"It is urged, however, that the Church relies on the Fourth Commandment as its perpetual authority for the observance of public worship. That public worship is commended, and inculcated as a voluntary duty, even under the gospel, I allow; but that it is a matter of compulsory enactment, binding on believers from the authority of this commandment, or of any Sinaitical precept whatever, I deny. With regard to the doctrine of those who consider the Decalogue as a code of universal morality, I am at a loss to understand how such an opinion should ever have prevailed; these commandments being evidently nothing more than a summary of the whole Mosaic law, as the fourth in particular is of the whole ceremonial law; which therefore can contain nothing applicable to the gospel worship.

"Whether the festival of *the Lord's day* (an expression which occurs only once in Scripture, Rev. i. 10.) was weekly or annual, cannot be pronounced with certainty, inasmuch as there is not (as in the case of the Lord's Supper) any account of its institution, or command for its celebration, to be found in Scripture. If it was the day of his resurrection, why, we may ask, should this be considered as the Lord's day in any higher sense than that of his birth, or death, or ascension? why should it be held in higher consideration than the day of the descent of the Holy Spirit? and why should the celebration of the one recur weekly, whereas the commemoration of the others is not necessarily even annual, but remains at the discretion of each believer?

"Neither can the circumstance of Christ's having appeared twice to his disciples on this day (if indeed the words *after eight days*, John xx. 26, are rightly interpreted the eighth day after) be safely adduced in proof of the divine institution of a new Sabbath; inasmuch as there can be no doubt that he appeared on other days also. Luke xxiv. 36, and John xxi. 3, 4: 'Peter saith unto them, I go a fishing,' which was not lawful on the Sabbath; so that the day following, on the morning of which Christ appeared, could not have been the first day of the week. Even supposing, however, that it had been so, still the assigning this as a reason for the institution of a new Sabbath is matter solely of human inference; since no commandment on this subject, nor any reason for such institution, is found in all Scripture.

"From commandments, of which we have proved the non-existence, we pass to examples; although no example can weaken the force of a contrary precept. We shall proceed, however, to prove that what are adduced as examples are not such in reality. First, then, with regard to Acts xx. 7, where it is related that the disciples dwelling at Troas 'came together to break bread upon the first day of the week,' who shall determine with certainty whether this was a periodical meeting, or only held occasionally, and of their own accord; whether it was a religious festival, or a fraternal meal; whether a special assembly convoked on that particular day, or a daily meeting like those recorded in chap. ii. 42, compared with ver. 46; lastly, whether this meeting was held by order of the apostles, or whether it was merely permitted by them in compliance with the popular custom, according to their frequent practice on other occasions?

"The inference deduced from 1 Cor. xvi. 2, is equally unsatisfactory; for what the apostle is here enjoining, is not the celebration of the Lord's Day, but that on the *first day of the week* (if this be the true interpretation of κατὰ μίαν σαββάτων, *per unam sabbathorum*) each should *lay by him* (that is at home) for the relief of the poor; no mention being made of any public assembly, or of any collection at such assembly, on that day. He was perhaps led to select the first day of the week, from the idea that our alms ought to be set aside as a kind of first-fruits to God, previous to satisfying other demands; or because the first day of the week was

most convenient for the arrangement of the family accounts. Granting, however, that the Corinthians were accustomed to assemble on that day for religious purposes, it no more follows that we are bound to keep it holy in conformity with their practice, without a divine command to that effect, than that we are bound to observe the Jewish Sabbath in conformity with the practice of the Philippians, or of Paul himself. Acts xvi. 13: 'on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made.' xvii. 2: 'Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scripture.' xviii. 3, 4: 'he abode with them and wrought. . . . . and he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath;' following his own occupation at home, as we have reason to believe, during the six remaining days.

"Those therefore who, on the authority of an expression occuring only once in Scripture, keep holy a Sabbath-day, for the consecration of which no divine command can be alleged, ought to consider the dangerous tendency of such an example, and the consequences with which it is likely to be followed in the interpretation of Scripture.

"Hence we arrive at the following conclusions:—First, that under the Gospel no one day is appointed for divine worship in preference to another, except such as the Church may setapart of its own authority for the voluntary assembling of its members, wherein, relinquishing all worldly affairs, we may dedicate ourselves wholly to religious services, so far as is consistent with the duties of charity; and, secondly, that this may conveniently take place once every seven days, and particularly on the first day of the week; provided always that it be observed in compliance with the authority of the Church, and not in obedience to the edicts of the magistrate; and likewise that a snare be not laid for the conscience by the allegation of a divine commandment, borrowed from the Decalogue; an error against which St Paul diligently cautions us, Col. ii. 16, 'let no man therefore judge you,' &c. For if we under the Gospel are to regulate the time of our public worship by the prescriptions of the Decalogue, it will surely be far safer to observe the seventh day, according to the express commandment of God, than on the authority of mere human conjecture to adopt the first. I perceive also that several of the best divines, as Bucer, Calvin, Peter Martyr, Musculus, Ursinus, Gomarus, and others, concur in the opinions above expressed."

168. CAVE, WILLIAM, D.D., *Vicar of Isleworth* (*born* 1637; *died* 1713).—Primitive Christianity; or, the Religion of the Ancient Christians in the first ages of the Gospel. Lond. 1675. 8vo.

Cave, though a credulous and not very judicious writer, continues to be read; and from his intimate acquaintance with the works of the Fathers, we may regard his chapter, "Of the Lord's-day, and the Fasts and Festivals of the Ancient Church," as, on the whole, a

true account of the opinions and practice of the early Christians, (Part 1., chap. vii.). There is one rather loose statement near the beginning of the chapter—namely, that Justin Martyr "assures us" that the resurrection of Christ was the true origin of the title of the Lord's Day; in proof of which, Cave adduces the last paragraph quoted above, p. 4, in the note; by turning to which it will be seen, that "the Lord's day" is not so entitled by Justin at all, and that the leading reason assigned for assembling on "Sunday" is, that God created the world on the first day of the week. Cave adds, that the early Christians "by this means observed a kind of analogy and proportion with the Jewish Sabbath which had been instituted by God himself."

"They looked upon the Lord's Day," says he, "as a time to be celebrated with great expressions of joy, as being the happy memory of Christ's resurrection, and accordingly restrained whatever might savour of sorrow and sadness. Fasting on that day they prohibited with the greatest severity, accounting it utterly unlawful, as Tertullian informs us (*De Cor. Mil.* c. 3, p. 102.). It was a very bitter censure that of Ignatius (or whosesoever that epistle was, for certainly it was not his), that whoever fasts on a Lord's Day is a murderer of Christ (*Ep. ad Philip.* p. 112). However, it is certain that they never fasted on those days, no not in the time of Lent itself; nay, the Montanists, though otherwise great pretenders to fasting and mortification, did yet abstain from it on the Lord's Day. (Tertul. *De Jejun.* c. 15.)."

After mentioning the laws of the emperors Constantine and Theodosius respecting it, and some later ecclesiastical enactments against conventicles, he proceeds:—

"Next to the Lord's Day, the Sabbath, or Saturday (for so the word *Sabbatum* is constantly used in the writings of the Fathers, when speaking of it as it relates to Christians), was held by them in great veneration, and especially in the eastern parts honoured with all the public solemnities of religion. For which we are to know, that the Gospel in those parts mainly prevailing amongst the Jews, they being generally the first converts to the Christian faith, they still retained a mighty reverence for the Mosaic institutions, and especially for the Sabbath, as that which had been appointed by God himself (as the memorial of his rest from the work of creation), settled by their great master Moses, and celebrated by their ancestors for so many ages, as the solemn day of their public worship, and were therefore very loath that it should be wholly antiquated and laid aside. For this reason it seemed good to the prudence of those times (as in others of the Jewish rites, so in this) to indulge the humour of that people, and to keep the Sabbath as a day for religious offices. Hence they usually had most parts of divine service performed upon that day, they met together for public prayer, for reading the Scriptures, celebration of the sacraments, and such like duties. This is plain not only from some passages in Ignatius, and Clemens's Constitutions, but from writers of more unquestionable credit and authority. Athanasius, bishop of Alexan-

dria, tells us, that they assembled on Saturdays, not that they were infected with Judaism, but only to worship Jesus Christ the Lord of the Sabbath (*Homil. de Sement.* in init.): and Socrates, speaking of the usual times of their public meeting, calls the Sabbath and the Lord's Day the weekly festivals, on which the congregation was wont to meet in the church for the performance of divine services. (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 8, p. 312.) Therefore the council of Laodicea, amongst other things, decreed that, upon Saturdays, the Gospels and other Scriptures should be read, that in Lent the Eucharist should not be celebrated but upon Saturday and the Lord's Day, and upon those days only in the time of Lent it should be lawful to commemorate and rehearse the names of martyrs. (*Can.* 16, 49, 51.) Upon this day also, as well as upon Sunday, all fasts were severely prohibited (an infallible argument they counted it a festival day), one Saturday in the year only excepted, viz., that before Easter day, which was always observed as a solemn fast; things so commonly known as to need no proof. But though the Church thought fit thus far to correspond with Jewish converts, as solemnly to observe the Sabbath, yet, to take away all offence, and to vindicate themselves from compliance with Judaism, they openly declared that they did it only in a Christian way, and kept it not as a Jewish Sabbath; as is expressly affirmed by Athanasius, Nazianzen, and others: and the forementioned Laodicean synod has a canon to this purpose, that Christians should not judaize, and rest from all labour on the Sabbath, but follow their ordinary works (*i.e.*, so far, as consisted with their attendance upon the public assemblies), and should not entertain such thoughts of it, but that still they should prefer the Lord's Day before it, and on that day rest as Christians; but if any were found to judaize, they should be accursed. (Athanas. *Homil. de Sement.* tom. i. p. 885. *Can.* 29.)

"Thus stood the case in the Eastern Church; in those of the West we find it somewhat different. Amongst them it was not observed as a religious festival, but kept as a constant fast, the reason whereof (as it is given by Pope Innocent, in an epistle to the Bishop of Eugubium, where he treats of this very case) seems most probable. 'If,' says he, 'we commemorate Christ's resurrection not only at Easter, but every Lord's Day, and fast upon Friday, because it was the day of his passion, we ought not to pass by Saturday, which is the middle time between the days of grief and joy; the apostles themselves spending those two days (viz., Friday and the Sabbath) in great sorrow and heaviness.' (Innocent. *Ep. ad Decium Eugubium*, c. 4, Sabbato vero.) He thinks no doubt ought to be made but that the apostles fasted upon those two days, whence the Church had a tradition that the sacraments were not to be administered on those days, and therefore concludes that every Saturday or Sabbath ought to be kept a fast. To the same purpose the council of Illiberis ordained that a Saturday festival was an error that ought to be reformed, and that men ought to fast upon every Sabbath. (*Can.* 36, p. 35.) But though this seems

to have been the general practice, yet it did not obtain in all places of the West alike. In Italy itself, it was otherwise at Milan, where Saturday was a festival."

In chap. ix. he treats of the usual worship, both public and private, of the primitive Christians.

A mere allusion is all that he bestows on "the controversies which in late times were raised about the Lord's Day,"—being, as he says, "unconcerned therein:" but it is obvious that he agrees in the main with Heylin, Sanderson, and Taylor. The editor of a late edition of his work, takes this occasion to affirm that "the obligatory observance of the Lord's Day can only be given up with the Bible." (See the London edition of 1839, edited by the Rev. William Trollope, M.A., vol. i. p. 115.) By which remark Mr Trollope makes it appear that he belongs to that numerous class of Christians, who cannot distinguish between the Bible and their own interpretations of it.

169. BAMPFIELD, FRANCIS (*see* No. 163).—Σαββατικὴ Ἡμέρα, Ἡμέρα Ἱερά, Septima Dies, Dies Desiderabilis, Sabbatum Jehovæ. The seventh-day Sabbath the desirable Day, the closing, completing Day of that first created Week, which was, is, and will be, the just measure of all succeeding Weeks in their successive courses, both for working in the six foregoing days, and for rest in the seventh, which is the last day, by an unchangeable law of well-established order, both in the revealed Word, and in created Nature. 1677. Fol. Pp. 149.

"Francis Bampfield died in Newgate, a martyr to Nonconformity—especially as one who could not conform in the matter of the Sabbath." (*The Sabbath and Lord's Day; a History of their Observance in the Christian Church.* [By William B. Maxson.] Being No. 4. of Tracts published by the American [Seventh-Day] Sabbath Tract Society. New York, 1853.)

170. COWELL, JOHN, "*a servant of Jesus Christ.*"—The Snare Broken: Being a true and faithful Account of the Author's Grounds for his leaving off the observation of the Sabbath of the First or Old Covenant: Wherein his Beam of Legal-Covenant-Light is darkened by the more clear shining forth of Gospel Light and Truth. Lond. 1677. 8vo. Pp. 152.

"About the beginning of the year 1661," says Mr Cowell, "my foot was taken in this snare [of the Seventh-day Sabbath], and

I began to wander in this by-path. And I continued (not meeting with the trouble I met afterwards about it) till the year 1664; and then understanding into what most desperate, dangerous, and pernicious principles and practices several Sabbath-keepers were rushing, I was greatly troubled. And for many of the persons concerned, they were no small ones neither amongst that people, as Thomas Tillam, Christopher Pooly, Edward Skipp, John Fox, &c., who in their principles, yea, in their practices too, with respect to their conversation, were become vile with a witness; and in their principles, yea, in their practices too, as with respect to the worship of God, were marvellously corrupted; pleading as for the Sabbath so also for circumcision (which they also practised), and for the observation of the whole law; yea, even to offerings and sacrifices, as may be seen in the propositions and queries of Christopher Pooly and Edward Skipp, printed 1664. . . . .

"And I being so troubled as I was, I could not well forbear, without bearing testimony against their pernicious ways, which I did in a book titled *Divine Oracles;* though yet, notwithstanding this eminent warning of the direct tendency of this Sabbath-keeping, I therein spake for the Sabbath, which, with my former work of that kind,—viz., the book titled *A Beam of Sabbath Light* (which hath since proved a heavy beam to me), I heartily repent me of. And I have good hope, through grace, that the remembrance of my miscarriage therein will be so sanctified of God to me, that it will be an humbling consideration to me whilst I live.

"But though I was troubled, as is above mentioned, yet I kept on in the practice still without much more trouble, till about the year 1668; and then, taking notice of the confusion that was amongst Sabbath-keepers in respect of their keeping of their Sabbath, I was again troubled. I observed an aptness in them (as it is in too many others) to cry out against their dissenting brethren for being in confusion in Babylon (as it is usually phrased) for a non-compliance with them in their notions, whereas they themselves are in as much confusion, if not more than most others, who are the men of their indignation. The confusion intimated was about their diverse beginning and ending of their Sabbath, some of them beginning to rest at sunset on the sixth day, and returning to their labour at sunset on the seventh day; others of them not beginning to rest till after sunset, at the shutting in of the evening light of the sixth day (which is known to be ordinarily an hour or more after sunset), and these not returning to their labour till about the same time on the morrow. So that it may be rightly concluded, that the one part keep part of the sixth day and part of the seventh for their Sabbath, or else that the other keep part of the seventh day and part of the first for their Sabbath.

"And, in the judgment of the one part (if they would judge righteously, and interest did not sway them), they must judge that the others do work part of the seventh day, and rest part of the first; whilst the others have the same ground to judge concerning

them, that they do rest part of the sixth day, and work part of the seventh, or else it must be thought that God did not set bounds to the days, that they might be known in their beginning and ending. Or otherways, as the complement of the whole, it may be thought that these men do not know the seventh day from the sixth nor the first; and so all the stir they make in the world and with the Churches about their seventh-day Sabbath, seeing they know not which is the seventh day (as their practice demonstrates), is not worth a rush, but instantly falls to the ground. . . . .

"But though I was troubled about this their confusion, as before I minded, yet I continued in the practice of this Sabbath-keeping notwithstanding, and yet made conscience of its observation; for length of time having so riveted it upon my spirit as it had, I was not without much ado brought off it. Yet hereby was I made to judge the more tenderly (as also I was upon the account of the things minded in the former section) of my dissenting brethren, and to delight more in communion with them, and in moderation towards them, which, from the beginning of my entertaining the notion, I had been careful concerning,—to the which I believe God graciously disposed my heart, in order to my return in his own time. . . . .

"And thus things stood with me till about the year 1671, and then the sad tendency of this Sabbath-keeping more clearly showed forth itself, the consideration of which (God graciously assisting me) I set myself seriously unto. And whereas the things before-minded did prove leading to my leaving off this practice, though more remote, this was leading much more near; as it was more near for time, so also for operation.

"Now that which about this time showed forth itself, was of a Sabbath-keeper in the town where I live (and she hath more fellows abroad), a Sabbath-keeper so strict in her Sabbath-keeping, that few others of them (if any at all) do match her for her zeal therein,—who is gone so far in her owning of the Sabbath, and the Law whence the rule of it is taken, that she shames not openly to disown the Gospel, and the Lord Jesus Christ, the author and revealer thereof, and in the greatness of her apostacy and degeneracy, denies the Lord Jesus Christ to be the Messiah and Saviour of the world,—having cast out of her Bible the whole New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,—disowning all those writings from the beginning of Matthew to the end of the Revelation, having in her Bible only those from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Malachi.

"Now, when I came to understand this, I was put to a very great stand indeed, and from this time was I made to question, and, as following thereupon, to scruple the practice very much—as who that fears God, and loves the Lord Jesus Christ, can think but I should?—and henceforth I determined to call the practice into question again, and to sift it thoroughly,—which I did with conscience, care, and circumspection, determining not to lean to my own understanding, which now I began to fear I had done

too too much before, when I first took upon me the practice, as indeed I judge too too many do to this day that are yet in the practice of it. . . . .

"Another thing that was leading to my leaving off this practice, as a thing more near both as to time and operation, was my calling over and seriously considering the principle of most, if not all Sabbath-keepers,—which they plead for in their ordinary discourses,—which they assert in their preaching in their assemblies,—which is also published in print, to the view of the world, by Mr Edward Stennet and Mr William Sellers (as I have seen); which is, of the penalty of death its being in force, for the profaning the Sabbath (as they phrase it). It's true I had knowledge of this principle being owned by many of them, while I went on without scruple in the practice of Sabbath-keeping; yea, I had read Mr Stennet's book, titled *The Seventh Day is the Sabbath*, wherein it's stated and pleaded. But my soul was not so touched in consideration of the thing, as it hath been since I came under scruples concerning it. . . . .

"But though Mr Stennet pleads for the penalty's being in force, yet in that they do not execute it, he would not have persons think there is no reason for it; and therefore he gives some reasons for it,—p. 52 of his book forementioned. And the first is, because they are no magistrates, whose work alone it is (he saith) to do it. To which I reply, that dissenting Christians may hereby see to whom they stand obliged for the preservation of their lives; even unto God, and his wise and gracious providential dealings, who keeps power and rule out of these men's hands. At present we are liable to the loss of our goods, for our dissenting from the present constitution in some religious observations; but, were these men magistrates, our lives would lie at stake, as Mr Stennet himself tells us.

"The present generation chastise us with whips for our dissenting; but were these men magistrates, they would chastise us with scorpions; so that by how much the life is more than meat, and the body than raiment (Matt. vi. 25), so is the present persecution lighter than theirs would be. And therefore dissenting Christians have ground to pray, From such magistrates, good Lord deliver us. . . . .

"The particulars hitherto insisted on were these that were leading to my leaving off this practice, some of which were more remote, and others were more near, both as to time and operation, even as I mentioned in the entrance to this discourse. And I doubt not but that the impartial, pious, peaceable, and spiritual Christian, will conclude they will bear the weight (at least) that I lay upon them. I therefore now proceed to those that were effective of it."—(Pp. 2, 6–8, 10–13, 18, 33–34, 51.)

Those means were,—1. "Earnestly seeking unto God;" 2. Diligent reading and impartial weighing several treatises on the subject, especially Dr Owen's *Exercitations*, and the *Examination* of them by Mr Sellers (Nos. 159 and 161); from the latter of which,

says he, "if I would have taken scoffs and bitter taunts at men learned and godly, for their stating things modestly they believe to be truths, I might have received full satisfaction; for with such the paper abounds." 3. Seriously searching the Holy Scriptures "with resolution to own what should be made out to me by them to be the will of my dear Redeemer. . . . And in my most diligent search, I could not find (whence it followed that I cast off the practice) that there was any command given by the Lord Jesus Christ unto the churches of the Gentiles for the observation of this Sabbath, or any word that might enforce the practice of it from Him, or any one of his holy apostles. Neither, secondly, could I find that ever any one such church did keep so much as one such Sabbath, much less that they should observe it in their weekly returns successively. But, thirdly, I observed, that in its being given to Israel, it was given to them (as other temporary commands were) to be a sign to them throughout their generations. And, fourthly, I observed that there is spoken by the apostle Paul that that might satisfy any unbiassed person that the churches of Christ should not take up nor run into this practice." (Pp. 56, 57.)

To the proof of these four propositions, pages 57–102 are devoted; and in the remainder of the volume, the author "speaks somewhat to the talk of some Sabbath-keepers about a command for, and examples of, this Sabbath-keeping." The talk chiefly commented on is that of Sellers, in a book entitled *Seventh-day Sabbath no Ceremony.*

Mr Cowell sees no sufficient evidence for a primeval Sabbath; but, assuming such to have been instituted, he maintains that we, living under the Christian dispensation, are not obliged to keep it:—

"Though I will not deny that Adam did keep this Sabbath, in that I do not know that he did not, neither can any man living know that he did not, unless it should by immediate revelation be made known unto him, in that the Scriptures speak nothing about it whether he did or no; yet I conclude that the text usually produced to prove it, Mark ii. 27, 'The Sabbath was made for man,' &c., doth not prove it. For not only is Israel called man, for whom it was made, and to whom it was given, Deut. v. 24; but others, even particular persons besides Adam, are called so frequently in Scriptures, as, if need were, might be proved by many testimonies. But if it were so that Adam kept this Sabbath in his state of innocency (as possibly he might), yet it doth not follow that therefore it is the duty of all persons now to keep it, as Sabbath-keepers assert. For,

"1. Marriage was a paradise institution, yet doth it not follow that therefore it is the duty of all persons to marry: a person may forbear to marry and yet not sin, 1 Cor. vii. 37, 38, 40.

"2. If it were given to Adam in his state of innocency, as possibly it might, and as Sabbath-keepers assert, yet is this so far from proving it to be the duty of men now, that it evidently shows the contrary; for all that profess the Christian religion, so far as

I know (I am sure Sabbath-keepers do), hold, that as Adam had a covenant in his state of innocency made with him, and in him with all his seed, so that this covenant was a covenant of works, and so the first, the old covenant: so that if the Sabbath were given to him in that state, it must needs be given to them as the rest of that covenant; and that covenant being vanished away, the rest of it must needs cease, and it cannot be again introduced without an open opposition to the new covenant and the Lord Jesus Christ, who hath sealed that covenant with his precious blood, and to the great prejudice of the Christian religion which is bottomed upon the new covenant, and the apparent damage of the professors thereof, as sad experience hath made manifest in the instances before given." (Pp. 106–8.)

The sufficiency of the law of nature, and that of Jesus in the Gospel, for men's guidance, is thus contended for:—

"And let none be at a stand upon the account of this discourse, questioning whether this will not make void those duties that we ought to perform to God and our neighbour, according to what is held forth in these commandments that are justly deemed moral. For as for such commands, they are not only our duty upon the account of the law of our creation, but they are often inculcated in the Gospel as the duty even of men as men as well as of Christians.

"And it is a desperate reflection upon Jesus Christ and the Gospel, that if this notion be not admitted of, viz., the Law its being the rule of our obedience, men may turn Ranters, &c., and that it is the opening of a gap to Ranterism. What! have we no rules for holiness from Jesus Christ, no rules how to behave ourselves as touching the duties of morality from Christ and the Gospel? yea, I doubt not to say the Gospel abounds herein, and that with the greatest perspicuity." (P. 115.)

He holds that in Matt. v. 16, 17, Christ speaks of the entire Law of Moses, and not of the Decalogue only; that the keeping of the Sabbath by our Lord, who was a Jew, is no pattern to us who are Gentile Christians; that his words in Matt. xxiv. 20, had reference only to Jews living among Jews obeying the Law of Moses; and that Paul's going into synagogues to persuade the Jews there assembled on Sabbath-days is sufficiently accounted for by his office of an apostle, which required him to embrace all fit opportunities to convert his countrymen. It might have been added that Paul was a Jew himself, and continued after his own conversion to obey the Law of Moses.*

* Olshausen writes thus in his *Biblical Commentary on the Gospels* (Edin. 1847):—"The first of the party divisions of the ancient Church was that of the *Jewish Christians*. As early as in the Epistle to the Galatians, Paul speaks expressly of persons who desired to bring the Galatian Christians again under the yoke of the law. They wished faith in Christ and his redemption to be regarded as insufficient for salvation, unless circumcision and the observance of the law were added. The great preacher of the Gentiles, however, zealously opposes this restricted idea of Christianity, and shows that the soul must lose Christ if

171. BARROW, ISAAC, D.D., *Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and an English Theologian of the first rank* (*born* 1630; *died* 1677).—A Brief Exposition of the Lord's Prayer and the Decalogue. Lond. 1681. 12mo.

This treatise is included in vol. vi. of the 8vo edition of his *Works*, Oxford, 1830; and in vol. iii. of the royal 8vo edition, Edinburgh, 1847. I subjoin the section on the Fourth Commandment; omitting, for the sake of brevity, those passages which merely amplify or illustrate opinions expressed with sufficient clearness in what is quoted here:—

"The Decalogue is in several places of Scripture (as we before noted) called a covenant with the Jewish people; and the observation of this law is likewise so called in a particular and special manner: it is expressed to have been appointed as a sign, or characteristical note, whereby their peculiar relation to God might be discerned, and they distinguished from all other people. As circumcision was a seal of the covenant made with Abraham and his posterity; so keeping the Sabbath did obsignate the covenant made with the children of Israel after their delivery out of Egypt: 'The children of Israel' (saith the text) 'shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant; it is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever' (Exod. xxxi. 16); and 'I gave them' (saith God in Ezekiel) 'my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which if a man do he shall live in them; moreover, I gave them my Sabbaths to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord who sanctifies them' (Ezek. xx. 11, 12, 20); and, 'Thou camest down

it seeks to use any other means of salvation. . . . *Still, Paul was by no means of opinion that those who were Jews by birth must not observe the law when they became Christians;* he rather favoured their doing so, if the pious customs of their fathers had become dear to them, or if their own weakness, or that of the Jews around them, would be offended by the contrary course. Hence the apostles who remained in Jerusalem till its destruction, as did Matthew and James, observed the law invariably, and so did Paul likewise when he was in Jerusalem. But the apostles, as well as their true disciples, were far from being desirous to impose this observance of the law upon the Gentiles also. The milder and really Christian view of the observance of the law was constantly entertained by many Jewish Christians in Palestine, who in later times were called *Nazarcans*. Many, on the contrary, took the wrong course, which the apostle Paul reproved in certain individuals in Galatia, and these obtained the name of *Ebionites*." (Vol. i. pp. xiii. xiv.)

There seems to be no reason for thinking that Paul was less obedient to the law of Moses in Greece, Italy, and Asia Minor, than in Jerusalem, except when he thought that by performing its rites he would impede his success in making converts to Christianity among the Gentiles. That he *did* for that reason sometimes renounce all Jewish practices, has been inferred from 1 Cor. ix. 20-23; but the passage need not be so broadly understood, and this interpretation of it is at variance with his own express declarations in Acts xxv. 8; xxviii. 17; Phil. iii. 6.

from mount Sinai' (say the Levites in Nehemiah) 'and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments; and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbaths' (Neh. ix. 13, 14); where 'making known to them the Sabbaths,' as also otherwhere 'giving them the Sabbath,' (Exod. xvi. 29), are expressions (together with the special ends of the Sabbath's appointment, which are mentioned in those places,) confirming the judgment of the ancient Christians, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, &c., who refer the first institution of the Sabbath to Moses, affirming (that which indeed the history by its total silence concerning the Sabbath before him sufficiently doth seem to confirm) that the patriarchs were not obliged thereto, nor did practise it.*

"And we may observe, that the law concerning the Sabbath is mentioned and insisted upon separately from the body of their laws, as being in nature different from the rest, and enacted upon a special design; as from the fore-cited passages appeareth, and further may appear from considering how the condition of proselytes (those of the stricter sort called proselytes of righteousness) is described in Esay: 'The sons of the strangers' (saith God in that prophet), 'that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant, even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer' (Isa. lvi. 6, 7); where to undertake the observance of the Sabbath, and to lay hold of the Jewish covenant, are signified to be coincident, or especially coherent.

"All the other precepts indeed (one passage in the Second Commandment, as it may be understood to prohibit absolutely the making of any similitude, being liable to exception) are immediately grounded in the reason of the thing, and have a necessary obligation, even visible to natural light; they consequently have been acknowledged as reasonable and obliging by the general consent of men; or might be so propounded and asserted by argument, as easily to extort such consent: but this command (although as to its general and remote matter it is most evidently reasonable, and requireth that which no man can deny to be a matter of necessary duty, yet) as to the more immediate matter, as to the determinate measure and manner of performing those general duties, no reason can discern an obligation distinct from, or antecedent to, the Lawgiver's will, to practise according thereto. That we should frequently with grateful and joyful sense reflect upon the glorious works of God;* (espe-

* Καὶ γὰρ μὴ σαββατίσαντες οἱ προωνομασμένοι πάντες δίκαιοι τῷ θεῷ ἐνηρέστησαν, &c. Just. p. 236.

Ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ ἤρξατο περιτομὴ καὶ ἀπὸ Μωσέως σάββατον, καὶ θυσίαι καὶ προσφοραί, &c.—261.

"'Abraham sine circumcisione, et sine observatione sabbatorum, credidit Deo, &c.' Iren. iv. 30.

"Tertul. *adv. Jud.* ii. 4.

cially that grand and fundamental one, wherein God's wonderful excellencies of goodness, wisdom, and power, were so illustriously displayed, the creation of the world; wherein so great accomodations and benefits were generally dispensed to all the creatures, and to us eminently among them; remembering with deepest respect and most hearty thankfulness our bountiful Maker;)* that we should not be unmindful of the special favours by God's gracious providence vouchsafed to our country, our relations, ourselves (especially such very signal ones as was that of the delivery from Egyptian slavery in a manner so remarkable and miraculous;) that we should not spend ourselves and our time in perpetually carking and labouring about affairs touching our body and this present life; but should assign some competent time both for the relaxation of our mind, and for attendance to the concernments of our soul: that also we should allow fitting time of respite and refreshment to those of our brethren whom divine providence hath disposed into a meaner condition and relation of servants to us; that their lives may not by incessant care and toil be rendered overburdensome and grievous to them, but so that they may with some comfort serve us; that also they be not destituted of leisure and opportunity to serve God, our common Master, and to regard the welfare of their souls, no less precious than our own: that also we should show some kindness and mercy even toward our beasts, allowing them some ease from their painful drudgeries in our behalf: these are all of them things which reason evidently dictates, which common sense must needs admit, as duties of piety, justice, and humanity; and to secure the performance of them, both as to the substance, due measure, and fit manner of them, common prudence would suggest that set times should be appointed, in which they should be solemnly and notoriously discharged under the public testimony and cognizance; and accordingly we find that, in all wise and civil societies, some provision ever hath been made, by appointing festival times, for the practice of such duties, in some kind or degree: 'The founders of laws' (saith Seneca) 'did institute festival days, that men should publicly be constrained to cheerfulness; interposing as necessary a temperament of their pains.'† Plato, with a more admirable sagacity, refers the invention, or first institution, of such times unto God himself: 'The gods' (saith he, that is, the divine Providence administering affairs here by the ministry of inferior invisible powers, according to his notion and manner of speaking), 'pitying mankind born to painful labour, appointed, for an ease and cessation from their toils, the resources of festival seasons observed to the gods.'‡ Thus, I say, reason acknowledges the substance of these

* "Psal. cxliii. 5; xcii. 4; cvii. 22; xxvi. 7; cxlv. 10.

† "Legum conditores festos instituerunt dies, ut ad hilaritatem homines publice cogerentur, tanquam necessarium laboribus interponentes temperamentum." Sen. *De Tranq. An.*

‡ *Θεοὶ δὲ οἰκτίραντες τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπίπονον φῦρυκὸς γένος ἀναπαύλας τε αὐτοῖς τῶν πόνων ἐτάξαντο τῶν ἑορτῶν ἀμοιβὰς τοῖς θεοῖς.* Plat. *De Leg.* ii. p. 787.

duties, and approves the securing their performance, as a good end, or fit matter of law, both divine and human. But as to the circumstantial determination of measure and manner; that a seventh day precisely should be assigned; that a total cessation from labour for man and beast should be prescribed; this is above reason to discern a necessity of, or a conveniency in comparison with other limitations in those respects devisable and practicable: nor can we assuredly resolve the obligation thereto into any other ground than the pleasure of the most wise Author of this law, who did see what was most fit to be prescribed to those whom this law concerned. Here is indeed mentioned a reason, why God specially did choose this day to bless and sanctify it in this manner to such purposes; namely his resting upon the seventh day from his works of creation; the which yet doth not certainly import a natural conveniency, toward accomplishing those purposes, of this precise quantity of time, or in this way of observing it, in preference to any other that might have been appointed; it only seemeth to imply a fitness of these determinations, as containing somewhat of profitable significancy, that such a correspondency in circumstance of time, and manner of practice, might admonish us concerning the substance of our duty, or a principal part thereof, peculiarly designed in the sanction of this law, the grateful commemoration of God's most glorious work (the foundation, as it were, of all other his acts of beneficence), the creation of the world: for thus in all ceremonial institutions we may observe, that some significant circumstance is selected on purpose to instruct or excite us to practice, by representing to our fancy the nature and intention of the main duty required; as in circumcision, in the passover, in baptism, and other ritual constitutions, it is not hard to perceive: so it being God's design to enforce the performance of that excellent duty, by appropriating a time thereto, we may conceive that he therefore especially selected that day, as most apt to mind them to whom this law was given of the history of the creation; the reflecting upon and celebrating which was the main duty intended.

"Seeing, therefore, the observation of the Sabbath is expressed to have a peculiar respect to the children of Israel, as a sign of the covenant made with them when He led them out of Egypt; seeing in its own nature it differeth from the rest of the 'Ten Laws,' the obligation thereto being not, discernibly to natural light, grounded in the reason of the thing, we can nowise be assured that an universal and perpetual obligation thereto was intended, or that its obligation did extend further than to the Jews, to whom it was as a formal law delivered, and upon special considerations severely inculcated; to whose humour, condition, and circumstances, it might also perhaps be particularly suited: Justin Martyr was of opinion that this law, as many others, was given to the Jews διὰ τὴν ἀνομίαν, καὶ σκληροκαρδίαν, 'for their iniquity and hardness of heart,'* by way of concession and indulgence. . . . However, that this law (as to its

* "Just. *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 235, &c."

circumstantial parts) was not intended to oblige generally and perpetually, we have a most forcible ground to suppose; St Paul himself his express discharging Christians from the observation thereof; yea, his earnest reprehension of some persons for rigorously insisting thereon, deeming it themselves, and urging it upon others, as a necessary duty to observe it; his conjoining it with other ceremonial observances, whose nature was merely symbolical, and whose design was to continue no longer than till the real substance of that which they represented came into full force and practice: 'Let no man' (saith he to the Colossians) 'judge you for meat, or drink, or upon account of a festival day, or new moon, or sabbath' (Col. ii. 16-17.—σαββάτων and σαββάτου are both read; both equivalent); 'which things are the shadow of future things, but the body is of Christ' (that is, they did only prefigure and presignify; the real substance intended and represented by them is somewhat in the law and doctrine of Christ; which coming immediately to appear and to oblige, that shadow vanisheth, and ceaseth to have any regard due thereto. Again more sharply to the Galatians, whom some Judaizing dogmatists had reduced, or were reducing to the practice of legal rites, under conceit of needful obligation to them: 'How' (saith he) 'do ye return again to those weak and beggarly elements, to which back again you are pleased to be enslaved? Ye observe days, and months, and years' (Gal. iv. 10); which words, that they relate generally to the Jewish festivals, the context doth plainly enough show, and there is good reason to think that they chiefly respect the Sabbath we treat on, for which probably these men had the greatest respect and zeal. Again in the 14th to the Romans, the same great patron and champion of Christian liberty not obscurely declareth his mind, that Christians of strength in judgment did regard no day above another, but esteemed all days (he excepteth none) alike, as to any special obligation, grounded upon divine law and right; in subordination to which doctrine we may add, that this appears with great evidence to have been the common opinion of the wisest and most orthodox Christians in the primitive church, the most constant and strict adherents to catholic tradition (who from the apostles' instruction best understood the purport and limits of the liberty purchased by Christ), that this law, as it was not known or practised before Moses, so it ceased to oblige after Christ; being one of the shadows which the evangelical light dispelled, one of the burdens which this law of liberty did take off us.*

"Now, although upon these accounts we cannot press the strict observation of this law in all its parts, according to its literal and direct intention, yet we may learn much of our duty, much of God's will from it. All God's laws, spiritually and wisely understood, did tend to the promoting of piety and virtue, and abstracting from the special circumstances of that people to whom they were consigned, may (so far as our case is like theirs, and wherein a com-

* "Inter omnia decem præcepta solum ibi quod de sabbato positum est figurate observandum præcipitur." Aug. *Ep.* 119.

mon reason doth appear) pass for fit patterns for us to imitate, suggesting proper means of exercising, nourishing, increasing those qualities in us: and so from this law we may learn these duties:

"1. That we should frequently call to mind and consider the great and glorious works of God, performed for the general good of his creatures, and specially for mankind. . . .

"2. That we are bound to restrain ourselves in the prosecution of worldly business; not distracting our minds with care, not exhausting our bodies with toil about them; but allowing our mind convenient and seasonable freedom, affording our soul sufficient leisure with vigour and alacrity to enjoy its nobler entertainments, and to pursue its higher interests.

"3. That we are obliged to use the same indulgence toward those whom divine Providence hath disposed to be under our power, care, or governance; to allow our children, our subjects, our servants, a competent measure of rest and refreshment from their ordinary labours, sufficient time and leisure undistractedly to serve God, and quietly to mind their spiritual welfare. . . .

"4. That we must not be unmerciful to any creature; not only abstaining from inflicting, in wantonness of humour, needless vexation upon them, but also from wearying and grieving them too much for our emolument or convenience. . . .

"5. We may hence further learn, that it is fit certain times should be allotted for the public and solemn performance of the forenamed duties; common reason prompteth, that God (upon whose protection and disposal the public good depends) should be publicly honoured, and his benefits frequently acknowledged; also that care should be taken in every society, that all states of men should lead their lives in some competent degree of content; that all objects of grievous pity should be removed from public view; also common sense will inform us, that these things cannot effectually be executed without constituting definite periods of time, and limiting circumstances, according to which they shall be practised under public inspection and censure. And these dictates of ordinary prudence the divine Wisdom hath ratified by his exemplary order; the which, in cases wherein he hath not interposed his direct authority by way of precept, may serve for a good direction to governors, what they may with safety, what they should in wisdom, establish; what provision they should make for the promotion of piety and virtue; such a precedent requires greatest veneration and respect, [and] cannot but appear of high moment in consultation about matters of this nature.

"It is indeed particularly observable, that in this command there is not an express order concerning the natural or moral service of God (by prayer, or hearing God's Law) to be publicly performed on this day; but the Jews were themselves so wise as to understand these duties couched in the sanctification of the day prescribed to them; and accordingly they practised: they in all places of their habitation did settle synagogues and oratories; to them upon this day they resorted; in them then they did offer devotions to God (as the names

προσευχαὶ and προσευκτήρια do import); the Scribes did read the Law, and expound it to the people. 'Moses' (saith Josephus) 'did command the people to assemble for hearing of the Law, not once, or twice, or many times, but every seventh day,* laying aside their works, and exactly to learn it;'† whence, addeth he, the people became so skilful in the laws, that 'if one asked any of them concerning them, they would more easily tell them all than his own name;'‡ whence also an admirable concord in mind and uniformity in practice did, as he further observes, arise; and 'the custom,' saith Philo, 'was always as occasion gave leave, especially upon the seventh days, to philosophate,'§ &c. In consideration of which practice it was, that the Jews so highly valued this precept, that it was a saying among them, 'The Sabbath weigheth against all the commandments;'‖ as procuring them all to be known and observed. And if that blind people could pick these duties out of this law, much more should we see ourselves obliged, according to analogy thereof, to appoint set times for ensuring the practice of them.

"6. Again; we may hence also learn our obligation to submit obediently to the constitution of governors relating to this matter; that we readily should observe all solemn times of festivity and rest, which the rulers of church or state do appoint for the securing or the promoting those purposes of piety or charity, according to the measure and manner prescribed by them. For reason approving the thing as good and useful, and divine order more clearly and fully confirming it to be so, and it not appearing that God hath made express determinations about it, it remains, that it is left wholly to them to whose care God hath entrusted the public welfare, and hath committed to their judgments the provided means conducible thereto; having also, consequently, enjoined us in all lawful things to follow their guidance and appointment in order thereto. God decreed death to be inflicted on those who violated his command concerning the Sabbath, which showeth how great a fault it is to offend in this particular; and we may reasonably esteem that command to be his which proceedeth from his ministers by authority from himself, and in conformity to his own pattern.

"7. We add, that whereas God required of the Jews such a portion of time to be solemnly dedicated to religion and mercy, we, to whom he hath vouchsafed higher benefits, and proposed greater encouragements, cannot reasonably but deem ourselves obliged to sequester and to consecrate as much or more time to the same intents."

* [The sufficiency of Josephus' warrant for this assertion has been questioned. See above, i. 116.]

† Οὐκ εἰσάπαξ ἀκροασαμένους, οὐδὲ δὶς, ἢ πολλάκις, ἀλλ' ἑκάστης ἑβδομάδος τῶν ἔργων ἀφεμένους, ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρόασιν τοῦ νόμου ἑκέλευσε συλλέγεσθαι, καὶ τοῦτον ἀκριβῶς ἐκμανθάνειν. Joseph. *Adv. Ap.* ii. p. 946.

‡ Ἡμῶν δ' ἐντεῦθεν εἴ τις ἔροιτο τοὺς νόμους ῥᾷον ἂν εἴποι πάντας, ἢ τοὔνομα τὸ ἑαυτοῦ. Joseph. *Adv. Ap.* ii. p. 947.

§ Εἷς γὰρ ἦν, ἀεὶ μὲν κατὰ τὸ παρεῖκον, προηγουμένους δὲ ταῖς ἑβδόμαις, φιλοσοφεῖν, &c. Philo. *De Vit. Mos.*

‖ "Midrash. Exod. xxvi."

172. BARCLAY, ROBERT, *a Scottish Quaker of great ability and learning* (*born* 1648; *died* 1690).—An Apology for the True Christian Divinity, as the same is held forth and preached by the people called, in scorn, Quakers: Being a full Explanation and Vindication of their Principles and Doctrines, by many arguments deduced from Scripture and Right Reason, and the testimonies of famous Authors, both ancient and modern; with a full Answer to the strongest Objections usually made against them. 1678. 4to.

This well-known treatise was originally published in Latin at Amsterdam in 1676, and the translation was by the author himself. A fourth English edition appeared at London in 1701, and several others have followed it. In 1850 a neat cheap reprint was published at Manchester by William Irwin.

Fifteen propositions are laid down by Barclay, of which the eleventh ("Concerning Worship") is as follows:—

"All true and acceptable *worship* to God is offered in the inward and immediate moving and drawing of his own Spirit, which is neither limited to places, times, nor persons. For though we are to worship him always, and continually to fear before him; yet as to the outward signification thereof, in *prayers*, *praises*, or *preachings*, we ought not to do it in our own *will*, *where* and *when* we will; but *where* and *when* we are moved thereunto by the stirring and secret inspiration of the Spirit of God in our hearts, which God heareth and accepteth of, and is never wanting to move us thereunto when need is, of which he himself is the alone proper judge. All other *worship*, then, both *praises*, *prayers*, or *preachings*, which man sets about in his own will, and at his own appointment, which he can both begin and end at his pleasure, do or leave undone as himself seeth meet, whether they be a prescribed form, as a liturgy, &c., or prayers conceived extempore by the natural strength and faculty of the mind, they are all but superstition, will-worship, and abominable idolatry in the sight of God, which are now to be denied and rejected, and separated from, in this day of his spiritual arising: however it might have pleased him (*who winked at the times of ignorance*, with a respect to the simplicity and integrity of some, and of his own innocent seed, which lay as it were buried in the hearts of men under that mass of superstition), to *blow upon the dead and dry bones*, and to raise some breathings of his own, and answer them; and that until the day should more clearly dawn and break forth."

In illustration of this proposition he says: "The *duty of man* towards God lieth chiefly in these two generals. 1. *In an holy conformity to the pure law and light of God, so as both to forsake the evil, and be found in the practice of those perpetual and moral pre-*

cepts of righteousness and equity. And, 2. *In rendering that reverence, honour, and adoration to God, that he requires and demands of us,* which is comprehended under Worship. Of the former we have already spoken, as also of the different relations of Christians, as they are distinguished by the several measures of grace received and given to every one, and in that respect have their several offices in the *body of Christ,* which is the church. Now I come to speak of Worship, or of those acts, whether private or public, general or particular, whereby man renders to God that part of his duty which relates immediately to him; and as *obedience is better than sacrifice,* so neither is any sacrifice acceptable but that which is done according to the will of him to whom it is *offered.* But men finding it easier to sacrifice in their own wills than obey God's will, have heaped up sacrifices without obedience; and thinking to deceive God, as they do one another, give him a show of reverence, honour, and worship, while they are both inwardly estranged and alienated from his holy and righteous life, and wholly strangers to the pure breathings of his Spirit, in which the acceptable sacrifice and worship is only offered up. Hence it is that there is not any thing relating to man's duty towards God, which, among all sorts of people, hath been more vitiated, and in which the devil hath more prevailed, than in abusing man's mind concerning this thing; and as among many others, so among those called Christians, nothing hath been more out of order and more corrupted, as some Papists, and all Protestants, do acknowledge. As I freely approve whatsoever the Protestants have reformed from Papists in this respect, so I meddle not at this time with their controversies about it. . . . . .

"And first, let it be considered, that what is here affirmed is spoken of the worship of God in these *gospel times,* and not of the worship that was under or before the *law;* for the particular commands of God to men *then* are not sufficient to authorize us *now* to do the same things, else we might be supposed at present acceptably to offer sacrifice as they did, which all acknowledge to be ceased. So that what might have been both commendable and acceptable under the law, may justly now be charged with superstition, yea, and idolatry. So that impertinently, in this respect, doth Arnoldus rage against this proposition (*Exercit. Theolog.,* sect. 44), saying, 'That I deny all public worship, and that, according to me, such as in Enoch's time publicly began to call upon the name of the Lord; and such as at the command of God went thrice up to Jerusalem to worship; and that Anna, Simeon, Mary, &c., were idolaters, because they used the public worship of those times.' Such a consequence is most impertinent, and no less foolish and absurd than if I should infer from Paul's expostulating with the Galatians for their returning to the Jewish ceremonies, that he therefore condemned Moses and all the prophets as foolish and ignorant, because they used those things; the forward man not heeding the different dispensations of times, ran into this impertinency. Though a spiritual worship might have been, and no

doubt was, practised by many under the law in great simplicity, yet will it not follow that it were no superstition to use all those ceremonies that they used, which were by God dispensed to the Jews, not as being essential to true worship, or necessary as of themselves for transmitting and entertaining an holy fellowship betwixt him and his people, but in condescension to them who were inclinable to idolatry. Albeit then in this, as in most other things, the substance was enjoyed under the *law* by such as were spiritual indeed; yet was it veiled and surrounded with many rites and ceremonies, which it is no ways lawful for us to use now under the *gospel*.

"Secondly, Albeit I say, that this *worship* is neither limited to times, places, or persons; yet I would not be understood as if I intended the putting away of all set times and places to worship God forbid I should think of such an opinion. Nay, we are none of those that *forsake the assembling of ourselves* together, but have even certain times and places in which we carefully meet together (nor can we be driven therefrom by the threats and persecution of men) to *wait upon God* and *worship him*. To meet together, we think necessary for the people of God; because, so long as we are clothed with this outward tabernacle, there is a necessity to the entertaining of a joint and visible fellowship, and bearing of an outward testimony for God, and seeing of the faces of one another that we concur with our persons as well as spirits: to be accompanied with that inward love and unity of spirit, doth greatly tend to encourage and refresh the saints. . . . It appears then, that we are not against *set times* for worship, as Arnoldus against this proposition, sect. 45, no less impertinently allegeth offering needlessly to prove that which is not denied; only these times being appointed for outward conveniency, we may not therefore think with the Papists that these days are holy, and lead people into a superstitious observation of them, being persuaded that *all days are alike holy in the sight of God*. And although it be not my present purpose to make a long digression concerning the debates among Protestants about the *first day of the week*, commonly called the Lord's Day; yet forasmuch as it comes fitly in here, I shall briefly signify our sense thereof.

"We not seeing any ground in Scripture for it, cannot be so superstitious as to believe that either the Jewish Sabbath now continues, or that the first day of the week is the antitype thereof or the true Christian Sabbath, which, with Calvin, we believe to have a more spiritual sense; and therefore we know no more obligation by the Fourth Command or elsewhere to keep the first day of the week more than any other, or any holiness inherent in it. But, first, forasmuch as it is necessary that there be some time set apart for the saints to meet together to wait upon God and that, secondly, it is fit at some times they be freed from their other outward affairs; and that, thirdly, reason and equity doth allow that servants and beasts have some time allowed them to be eased from their continual labour; and that, fourthly, it appear

that the apostles and primitive Christians did use the first day of the week for these purposes; we find ourselves sufficiently moved for these causes to do so also, without superstitiously straining the Scriptures for another reason; which, that it is not to be there found, many Protestants, yea, Calvin himself, upon the Fourth Command, hath abundantly evinced. And though we therefore meet, and abstain from working upon this day, yet doth not that hinder us from having meetings also for worship at other times." (§§ I.–IV.)

173. ALTINGIUS, JAMES, *Professor of Hebrew at Groningen* (*born* 1618; *died* 1679).—Opera Omnia Theologica, &c. Amst. 1687. 5 vols. folio.

The fifth volume contains a treatise *De Tempore Instituti Sabbathi.*

174. GREGORY, JOHN, *Archdeacon of Gloucester.*—A Discourse of the Morality of the Sabbath, on Exod. xx. 8–11. Lond. 1681. 8vo.

175. TOWERSON, GABRIEL, D.D., *Rector of St Andrew Undershaft, London* (*died* 1697).—An Explication of the Catechism of the Church of England, vol. ii., on "The Decalogue, with an Introduction on God's both Natural and Positive Laws." Lond. 1681. Fol.

176. WAITE, J., "*minister of God's Word, London.*"—The Parent's Primer and the Mother's Looking-Glass: or Counsel for Parents in the Education of Children, for their Temporal, Spiritual, and Eternal Happiness. In a Dialogue between a Minister and a Father. To which is added a Second Dialogue of the Decalogue; and to that a Third Dialogue concerning the Sabbath Day. Lond. 1681. 8vo. Pp. 282.

In the last-mentioned dialogue, the Puritan opinions about the Sabbath are advocated; the author holding also that "from even to even is the measure of the Sabbath, from the beginning to the end of the world." He argues that "a first-day Sabbath is (in a sense) of as great antiquity as the first Sabbath ordained for Adam in innocency. Though that was at the end of God's work, it was at the beginning of man's life. God ended his week with a Sabbath; but man began his week with a Sabbath. It seems he was made at the end of the sixth day, to begin his life on the seventh day, which was his

first day, though he was made a moment before the day began. Adam was a type of Jesus, who began his new life at his resurrection with a Sabbath, the first day of the week. And so must we begin our week with a Sabbath: a day for God first, which is certainly more acceptable to God than to serve ourselves six days first, and then put off God (blessed for ever) with an odd day at last." (P. 227.)

But he omits to explain how the Sabbath could be a day of rest, unless the days of labour went before it from the first.

177. STRAUCHIUS, ÆGIDIUS, *a German Lutheran divine* (*born* 1632; *died* 1682).—Breviarium Chronologicum, lib. i. cap. ii. Lond. 1704. (Translation by Richard Sault. Lond. 1722.)

178. VOIGHTIUS, GODFREY, *a German theologian* (*born* 1644; *died* 1682).—Dissertatio de Viâ Sabbathi, apud Thesaur. Theol. Philol., tom. ii. p. 417, *et seq.*

179. SUICER, JOHN CASPAR, *Professor of Hebrew and Greek in the University of Zurich* (*born* 1620; *died* 1684).—Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, è Patribus Græcis ordine alphabetico exhibens quæcunque phrases, ritus, dogmata, hæreses, et hujusmodi alia spectant. Editio secunda, priori emendatior, elegantior et longe auctior. Amst. 1728. 2 vols. fol.

A work of vast erudition, in which see particularly the articles Σάββατον and Κυριακή. The quotations from the Fathers, concerning the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, are many and various. The first edition was published at Amsterdam in 1682.

180. The Patriarchal Sabbath. 1683.

Of this work I know nothing beyond what is mentioned by Dr Isaac Watts, in the following note to one of his discourses on *The Holiness of Times, Places, and People, under the Jewish and Christian Dispensations*, p. 51 (Lond. 1738). He says:—

"There is a learned author has written a treatise, 1683, whose running title is, *The Patriarchal Sabbath*; and he also, by computation drawn from the 16th chapter of Exodus, says: 'As God at the institution of the Passover appointed that month to be the first to the Israelites, which was not the first in respect of the creation, so he purposed to change the beginning of the week to the Israelites, and appoint that day their seventh, which was the sixth in the

patriarchal account. And he left a plain note or character upon it' (perhaps he means the withholding the manna), p. 99. And in p. 186, he says: 'All communion with the heathens is pathetically forbidden to the Jews, lest they should by that means be drawn to idolatry; and therefore we have less reason to wonder that God should appoint the Jews another day for their weekly Sabbath than that which was instituted at first to all mankind, when the Gentiles had perverted the consecration of that day to the worship of the Sun. And for the like reason the Christian church changed the name of Sunday into that of the Lord's-day, that she might secure her children from the opinion of the heathen world, that it was in honour of the planet of the Sun.'

"But besides this, he adds, p. 188: 'The more special reason of God's appointing them Saturday for their Sabbath, was because Saturday was the first day of rest they had from Egyptian bondage: for they marched from Rameses on Friday the fifteenth day of the first month, and set up their booths at Succoth on Saturday,' which I suppose this author takes to be too laborious a work for a Sabbath; and that therefore Saturday could not be the ancient Sabbath, but the next day they rested there."

181. LEIGHTON, ROBERT, D.D., *Archbishop of Glasgow* (*born* 1613; *died* 1684.)—An Exposition of the Ten Commandments, in his Works, vol. iv. Lond. 1820. 8vo.

He treats of the Sabbath in pp. 135–141, where the Puritan opinions regarding it are taught. But he allows that the commandment for its observance "is not so written in nature as the rest, but depends wholly upon particular institution, which may also be the cause why it is so large, and the form of it alone, amongst all the ten, both negative and positive." (P. 136.) The Sabbath is regarded as being mainly "the badge, and the preserver and increaser of all piety and religion;" and mere rest from labour, he thinks, "cannot be a sanctifying of this day unto God, unless it be accompanied with spiritual exercise,"—with which, both in private and in public, we ought to be "wholly possessed and taken up." This duty of solemn worship he holds to be implied in the phrase, "It is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" besides which, "the antithesis that seems to be in that word, 'In six days thou shalt do all thy work,' imports, that on the seventh thou shalt do God's." In reference to the same clause he observes: "The command of due labour and diligence in our particular callings is not of this place; it belongs properly to the eighth precept, and, in some way, to the seventh: here, it is only mentioned permissively, and for illustration of this duty here enjoined." (P. 137.) In the six days of labour we are not to forget God's worship, but to walk with him daily and constantly; "only, the peculiar of *this* day is, that we may not divide it betwixt heaven and earth, but it shall

be wholly for the service of God, and no work at all to have place in it that may hinder that, and suits not with the sanctifying of it: for so we are to understand the word, 'No manner of work.'" (P. 138.) He condemns sporting and pastimes on the Sabbath-day, because the use of them "is not to make it a Sabbath to God, but to our lusts and to Satan; and hath a stronger antipathy with the worship of God, and that temper of mind they intend in it, than the hardest labour." (P. 140.)

In his sermon on "Love the fulfilling of the Law," he says: "They that understand the true use of that holy rest of the Sabbath-day, do know that it frees the soul, and makes it vacant from earthly things for this purpose, that it may fully apply itself to the worship and contemplation of God, and converse with Him at greater length. Then, certainly, where there is this entire love to God, this will not weigh heavy, will be no grievous task to it: it will embrace and gladly obey this Fourth Commandment, not only as its duty, but as its great delight. For there is nothing that love rejoices in more than in the converse and society of those on whom it is placed: it would willingly bestow most of its time that way, and thinks all hours too short that are spent in that society. Therefore not only they who profanely break, but they who keep it heavily and wearily, who find it rather a burthen than a delight, may justly suspect that the love of God is not in them: but he that keeps His day cheerfully, and loves it, because on it he may more liberally solace and refresh himself in God, may safely take it as an evidence of his love to God." (Vol. iii. pp. 424–5.)

In harmony with this passage, Leighton is described by Bishop Burnet as having been "possessed with the highest and noblest sense of Divine things that I ever saw in any man. . . . . He brought himself into so composed a gravity, that I never saw him laugh, and but seldom smile. And he kept himself in such a constant recollection, that I do not remember that ever I heard him say one idle word. There was a visible tendency in all he said, to raise his own mind, and those he conversed with, to serious reflections. He seemed to be in a perpetual meditation." (*Hist. of his own Time*, B. ii.)

His fervent piety was a natural gift, but one which ordinary mortals have not received. Men of naturally cold religious feelings (made colder still, perhaps, by the anxieties and turmoil of business), *cannot* perform otherwise than "heavily and wearily" such Sabbath exercises as delighted the devout and contemplative Leighton; and hence, instead of blaming them for the weariness, or for avoiding it by omission, we may reasonably take Bishop Lake's advice, and "be content to have men *as good as we may*" (see above, i. 216)—a phrase for which some would substitute, "as good as even the Jews are anywhere in Scripture *required* by precept or example to be." (See above, i. 240-243, 261; ii. 13-16, 25-27, 33.)

For ten years before the Restoration, Leighton filled with honour the office of Principal of the University of Edinburgh. In

a letter written during that period, he exclaims: "Oh! what a weariness is it to live amongst men, and find so few men, and amongst Christians, and find so few Christians; so much talk, and so little action; religion turned almost to a tune and air of words; and amidst all our pretty discourses, pusillanimous and base, and so easily dragged into the mire; self and flesh, and pride and passion, domineering, while we speak of being in Christ, and clothed with him, and believe it because we speak it so often and so confidently." (*Life* prefixed to his Works, p. xlvii.) This picture but ill agrees with the statement often made, that the time when Sabbath-observance was so strictly enforced in Scotland by the Covenanters, "was a period of great religious light, and of great strictness and purity of morals." (See Principal Lee's Evidence before Sir A. Agnew's Committee of the House of Commons on Sabbath-observance, 1832; in their *Report*, p. 271, Q. 4109.) In opposition to this flattering representation, I have elsewhere (*Sabbath Laws*, pp. 441–6) quoted the following authorities:—*Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland*, p. 72 (Act for a public fast in 1642); Carlyle's *Cromwell*, ii. 72; *Diary of John Nicoll*, printed for the Bannatyne Club, pp. 1–34, 66, 107, 116, 189; Law's *Memorials*, p. 43; *The New Statistical Account of Scotland*, iii. 55; *The Spottiswoode Miscellany*, i. 230, *et seq.*; *Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session of Aberdeen*, printed for the Spalding Club; Hugh Binning's *Works*, pp. 518, 546; Orme's *Life of Owen*, p. 99; and three Acts of the Scottish Parliament, passed on 7th August 1645 and 1st and 13th February 1649, against drunkenness, impiety, fornication, and all other vices, therein described as openly abounding in the land (Thomson's edition of the *Acts of Parliament*, vi. 195, 360, 368). The only proof adduced by Principal Lee on his side of the question is a passage in the *History of the Church of Scotland*, written by Kirkton, a Covenanting minister, who was contemporary with Leighton, and writes as follows: "I have lived many years in a parish where I never heard an oath, and you might have rid many miles before you had heard any: also, you could not, for a great part of the country, have lodged in a family where the Lord was not worshipped by reading, singing, and public prayer. Nobody complained more of our church-government than our taverners, whose ordinary lamentation was, their trade was broke, people were become so sober." (P. 65.) Some remarks on this passage will be found in *Sabbath Laws*, p. 441.

182. SPENCER, JOHN, D.D., *Dean of Ely* (*born* 1630; *died* 1693).—De Legibus Hebræorum Ritualibus et earum Rationibus, libri quatuor. Cantab., 1727. 2 tom. fol., pp. 1232.

The first edition of this learned work was published in the author's lifetime (Cantab., 1685). Numerous additions to it were

left in manuscript to his executor, Archbishop Tenison, who bequeathed them to the University of Cambridge; and they are included in the edition of 1727, published under the care of Leonard Chappelow, professor of Arabic in the University. This enlarged edition contains four books, while the first has only three. The work was reprinted at the Hague in 1686, and at Leipsic in 1705.

Its chief design is to prove, in detail, that the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish religion were instituted in direct opposition to the practices of the surrounding idolatrous nations, and in order to establish the strongest distinction between the Jews and them. Accordingly, it regards the Sabbath as a peculiarly Jewish institution, "a sign" or mark distinguishing Israel from the heathen, and designed for the prevention of idolatry among the chosen people. Being a memorial of the creation of the heavenly bodies by Jehovah, it constantly reminded the Israelites that these favourite objects of pagan worship are themselves but creatures. (B. i., ch. 2., § 1, and ch. 5, §§ 7, 8, 9.) In § 10 of the last-mentioned chapter, rest from labour is maintained to be all that the Fourth Commandment prescribed to the Israelites; and the prevalent opinion, that it imposed the duty of spending the seventh day in what the moderns generally understand by "religious exercises," is represented to be at once unreasonable and unscriptural. The Hebrew word translated "sanctify" and "keep holy," signifies, he observes, the divinely-appointed separation of anything from a common to any peculiar use, as we see in Josh. xx. 7, and Joel ii. 15—to which he might have added Exod. xix. 23, xxxi. 13; Lev. xxvii. 30; Jer. xxii. 7; li. 27, 28.* (See above, i. 3, 110, 115, 137; Part IV. of Dr Campbell's sixth Preliminary Dissertation, prefixed to his *Translation of the Gospels*; Dr Chalmers' *Lect. on the Romans*, i. 46; Domville, ii. 177; Cox, 544; *Time and Faith*, 84.) The opinion of Cajetan (*Comment. in Exod.* x. 8) is quoted by him in support of the view contended for.

Hengstenberg, in his treatise on *The Lord's Day*, p. 91, has animadverted on this mode of interpreting the word translated "sanctify." He contends that "the passages brought forward by Spencer are not sufficient to prove that *sanctifying* meant merely setting apart, nor are there any passages from which it can be proved. Who, for instance, can fail to see that the words of Joel ii. 15, 'sanctify a fast,' mean not simply, fix a time for fasting, but appoint a *holy* fast; one which is, outwardly and inwardly, truly devoted to God? And again, the expression in Joshua xx. 7, 'and they sanctified Kedesh in Galilee,' indicates not only that they appointed it for an asylum, but that they consecrated it to God, so that it was an attack upon the rights of God for any one to endeavour to execute his right of vengeance upon a fugitive who had fled thither? Sanctifying the seventh day, therefore, can only mean the dedication of it to God. How this is to be performed must be determined from

* In Joshua the authorized English rendering is *appointed* (a city of refuge); in Jeremiah, *prepare* (the nations against Israel).

the idea itself, and from the accounts contained in the record of the Old Testament religion. The offering of a special sacrifice, and the holding of a sacred assembly (Lev. xxiii. 3), are a sufficient proof that the observance of the Sabbath demanded something more than mere inactive repose."

To this Spencer might have replied, that the meaning ascribed by Hengstenberg to the words "sanctified Kedesh in Galilee," is nowise at variance with the idea that *setting apart* (for the divinely appointed purpose of rest from work) is the whole meaning of the Hebrew word in the Fourth Commandment; since the Israelite who worked in the face of the divine prohibition, committed an act of impiety precisely analogous to that which the execution of the right of vengeance on a fugitive who had taken refuge in Kedesh is assumed to have been. If "to sanctify Kedesh" does not mean to set it apart as a place for the *worship* of God, why, he might have asked, must "sanctify the Sabbath-day" be equivalent to "set it apart as a *time* for His worship?" And as to the passage in Joel, how could the nature of the *fast* affect the meaning of the word enjoining its *appointment?* The possibility of dedicating the Sabbath-day to God by *resting* on it is undeniable; and the question whether this was the appointed mode of dedication must be determined, not from *our* idea of dedication, but from the ancient Hebrew idea, to be learnt solely "from the accounts contained in the records of the Old Testament religion." Now, in these records, we find an institution called the *Sabbath*, which is a Hebrew word meaning *rest* and nothing more. In the Fourth Commandment we find specified the duty of *resting*, and nothing more. In the other Mosaic laws regarding this institution, we see nothing but *rest* enjoined—not a syllable about spending the day in acts of worship, devout contemplations, and theological studies. In the numerous passages where the Israelites are reproved for profanation of the Sabbath, *working* on it is the only offence we ever find them charged with. In Neh. viii. 10–12 (corroborated, as to Sabbaths in particular, by Lev. xxiii. 33–40, Isa. xxx. 29, and Hos. ii. 11), there is the clearest evidence that, by "a day holy to the Lord," the ancient Jews understood a day which ought to be, or at least might very properly be, devoted to festive enjoyment; and accordingly, we learn from Luke xiv. 1–12, that neither Jesus, nor even the punctilious Pharisees, regarded feasting on the Sabbath-day as a breach of their law. By a special enactment, it is true, the *priests* were required to offer sacrifices additional to those offered on other days (Lev. xxviii. 3, 4, 9, 10, 24), but it could affect the people no otherwise than by furnishing them with additional viands; and if the words translated "an holy convocation" (Lev. xxiii. 3, and xxviii. 25), imply that the people were to hold "sacred assemblies" on the Sabbath, as on the other "feasts of the Lord" with which it is classed, still the *Jewish* idea of a sacred assembly, as indicated by the passages above referred to, must be understood. But in fact, the meaning of the phrase translated "an holy convocation" is far from being certainly such (see above, i. 19); and besides, whatever its true signi-

fication may be, it undoubtedly forms no part of the Sabbath-law delivered at Sinai—in which law, we may fairly assume, the *nature* of the institution was fully declared to the Israelites.

The opinion of Spencer is said by Hengstenberg to imply, that those who abstained from outward work on the Sabbath, "might turn their thoughts and feelings entirely away from God, or even indulge in gross excesses, without breaking the law" (p. 91). This is a true representation, if by "the law" we understand the Sabbath-law in the Decalogue, as Hengstenberg appears to do. But it would be most unfair to Spencer to imagine that he considered the Jews at liberty to make *a bad use* of the day of rest—to do on the Sabbath what was unlawful on *every* day. The chosen people were not exempt from the obligation which even the law of nature lays on all men to turn their leisure to good account, to abstain from vicious indulgence, and to perform on holidays such duties as cannot be sufficiently executed at other times.

With respect to the Lord's Day, Spencer thinks that the primitive church did wisely in appointing a weekly day for religious assemblies, and in choosing the first day of the week rather than the seventh, thereby showing that they worshipped God, not as their deliverer from Egypt, but as the Father of the Lord Jesus, who on that day had risen from the dead and delivered them from sin and the devil. (B. i. ch. 5, § 13.)

To Book ii. is appended a Dissertation on the Apostolic Decree, Acts xv. 20, which he truly calls "locum illum vexatissimum." (Pp. 588–626.)

183. BUNYAN, JOHN, *Author of "The Pilgrim's Progress"* (*born* 1628; *died* 1688).—Questions about the Nature and Perpetuity of the Seventh-day Sabbath; and Proof that the First Day of the Week is the true Christian Sabbath. Lond. 1685.

This little treatise will be found in the late edition of Bunyan's *Works*, edited by Mr George Offor, ii. 359–385. (Lond. 1853. Imp. 8vo.) In an advertisement prefixed to it, Mr Offor says: "The work was not reprinted until 1806, when it appeared in the third volume of Select Works by John Bunyan; since then it has been printed in two American editions. The reason why it was not republished probably was, that the churches of the 'Sabbath-keepers' soon after died away: at present we only know of three; the chief is at Mill-yard, London, where my talented antiquarian friend, W. H. Black, preaches to a little family on the Jewish Sabbath. These meetings are kept up by an endowment made by one of the former members of the church.* Bunyan's book does

* The particulars of this endowment are given in the Charity Commissioners' Report, dated 1837, and printed in 1840. The benefactor was Joseph Davis, who bought the meeting-house in 1691, and conveyed

not appear to have been answered; indeed, it would require genius of no ordinary kind to controvert such conclusive evidence." (Vol. ii. p. 360.)

184. BRYAN, MATTHEW, LL.D., *Lecturer of St Michael's, Crooked Lane, London.*—A Sermon on the Lord's Day, Exod. xx. 8. 1686. 8vo.

185. TURRETIN, FRANCIS, *Professor of Divinity at Geneva* (*born* 1623; *died* 1687).—Institutio Theologiæ Elencticæ. Gen. 1686. 3 tom. 4to.

Turretin's *Institutes* are still esteemed among the best systems of Calvinistic divinity. His works were reprinted at Edinburgh in 1847, 4 vols. 8vo.; in the second volume of which edition, pp. 68–92, will be found a discussion of the Sabbath question (*Inst.* Pars ii., Locus xi., Quæst. 13 et 14). The titles of the two sections are:—"13. *An in Præcepto Quarto sit prima institutio Sabbathi, et An mandatum sit partim morale, partim cæremoniale?* Prius Neg., Poster. Affirm." And, "14. *An institutio Dei Dominici sit divina, an humana; et An observationis sit necessariæ et perpetuæ, an vero liberæ et mutabilis?* Prius Affirm., et Poster. Neg., quoad utramque." His opinions on these points agree with the Westminster Catechism, except that he does not look upon bodily rest as in itself a religious duty—"a holy resting," as it is called in the Catechism. Passages from Calvin and other Reformers are quoted to show that they considered the religious observance of one day in seven as a perpetual and universal duty; but, as already mentioned (above, i. 129), it is difficult to reconcile this opinion with what Calvin has written in his *Institutes* and *Commentaries on St Paul's Epistles.*

186. ALLIX, PETER, *a French Protestant minister, who emigrated to England, and became canon of Windsor* (*died* 1717).—Reflections upon the Books of the Holy Scripture, to establish the Truth of the Christian Religion. Lond. 1688. 2 vols. 8vo. (Reprinted in Bishop Watson's *Collection of Theological Tracts*, vol. i.)

it to trustees in 1700, for the use of the congregation. By an instrument executed in 1706, he settled L.5 a-year on the teachers of congregations then existing in or near Norweston, Woodbridge, Braintree, Chertsey, Wallingford, Tewkesbury, Salisbury, Sherburn (in Buckinghamshire), or such of them as should have most need, "and so long as the said congregations and their teachers should continue in the faith, and religiously assembling and sanctifying the Lord's holy Sabbath-day, commonly called Saturday."

In the United States of America the "Sabbath-keepers" are more numerous than in England.

In chapter vii. (p. 236 of Watson), the author argues that the Sabbath was constantly observed from the beginning of the world until Moses. But he thinks with Grotius (above, i. 219), that it was not till the giving of the law at Sinai that what he holds to have been "an absolute necessity to abstain from all manner of work, even to the very dressing of meat necessary for the support of life," was imposed on the Jews. He observes farther: "Though the apostles had abolished the rigour of the law concerning the Sabbath, introduced by Moses, yet they themselves observed it; which practice of theirs, in all probability, gave occasion to the Christians, for almost four centuries, to keep the Sabbath as well as the first day of the week, solemnizing both the days, the one as a commemoration of the creation of the world, and the other of the resurrection of our Saviour Jesus Christ." It may, however, be doubted whether the Sabbath as well as the Lord's Day was kept by the early Christians generally, Gentile as well as Jewish; though a few of the Gentile converts may have been persuaded by their Jewish brethren to adopt the practice of those who still gave obedience to the law of Moses.

187. HOPKINS, EZEKIEL, D.D., *Bishop of Londonderry* (*born* 1633; *died* 1690).—An Exposition upon the Commandments. (Posthumously published at London in 1692, and included in his Works, of which the third edition, in 1 vol. folio, is dated 1710.)

The exposition upon the Fourth Commandment will be found at p. 125 of the third edition of his Works, or in the first volume of either of two editions published at London in 1809 (4 vols. 8vo) and 1841 (2 vols. royal 8vo).

He treats of the Sabbath under four heads:—"1. Its primitive institution; 2. Its morality and perpetual obligation; 3. Its change from the last to the first day of the week; and 4. The manner how God hath required it to be sanctified by us." In these respects he agrees with the Puritans; except that the phrase *moral law* is used by him as synonymous, not with *universal and perpetual*, but with *natural law* (see above, i. 242). "Those things," he observes, "are said to be moral, and of the law of nature, which are in themselves rational and fit to be done, although there were no express command to enjoin them. So that where there is a great equity in the thing itself, enough to sway a rational and honest man to the doing of it, that is to be accounted moral, and authorized by the law of nature." On the other hand, "that is of positive right which is observed only because it is commanded, and hath no intrinsical goodness or reason in itself to commend it to our practice, but obligeth us only upon the injunction and authority of another. . . The former are commanded because good; the latter are good because commanded." (P. 127.)

The Fourth Commandment he holds to be moral to the extent of requiring a convenient portion of time to be set aside for the service and worship of God: but "the law of nature doth not dictate to us any particular stated days to be set apart, one more than another;" and it is only from the positive will and command of God that the *seventh* day should be especially consecrated to his service and worship. But the command *having been given*, it "is as binding and forcible as if it were a law of nature engraven on our hearts, unless the same authority alter it that did first enjoin it. For this being a positive law, is therefore good and necessary, because commanded. And if it had not been revealed to us, we should never have been obliged to this observation, nor made obnoxious to punishment for failing in it.

"Yet again, this declaration of the will of God concerning the sanctification of the Sabbath is attended with a moral reason; and therefore is not merely and barely positive, as ceremonial laws are. Which reason is, that God rested on the seventh day, and therefore we ought so to do. Now, although this reason carries not such a natural evidence in it as to have obliged us unless it had been revealed, yet being revealed, we may discern a certain aptitude and fitness in it to oblige us to the observation of the seventh day rather than any other, since piety and religion require that we should imitate God in those things wherein he would have us to imitate him." (P. 128.)*

The observance of a Sabbath having "thus much of morality and of the law of nature in it, it is most certain," he adds, "that we are bound to keep a Sabbath as much as the Jews were; although not to the circumstance of the duty: For, 1. The command was obligatory even in Paradise itself in the state of innocency, and therefore contains nothing in it unworthy the state of a Christian;" being no ceremonial or typical command abolished by Christ. "2. The reasons of this command are all of them moral and perpetual, and therefore such is the obligation of it to us Christians. The equity is the same to us that it was to them."† 3. Our Saviour's injunction to his disciples to pray that their flight at the destruction of Jerusalem might not be in the winter or on the Sabbath-day (Matt. xxiv. 20), proves that about forty years after his death "those who were his disciples lay under an obligation of observing a Sabbath-day; because he intimates that it would prove an heavy addition to their affliction, if they should be forced to take their flight on the Sabbath, when they ought and desired to be employed in the spiritual exercise of devotion and holy duties proper to that day." (Pp. 128-9.)

In proof of Divine authority for the change of the day to the first of the week, he affirms that "Christ sanctified this day by his resurrection, and the apostles confirmed the observation of it, both by their writings and uniform practice; and it hath such an

* See Milton's reply to this argument, above, p. 51.
† See Milton again, above, pp. 48-49.

inviolable stamp of Divinity upon it, that now it is no more alterable to the end of the world.

"Nor is it needful," he continues, "that an express command of Christ should be brought for this change out of the New Testament; it is sufficient if by necessary consequence it may be deduced from Scripture. And yet we have express places of Scripture thus far, that the first day of the week is mentioned as the stated time for Christians to meet together, to preach, to hear, and to break bread in the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and to perform other duties of religion." (P. 129.) The texts referred to are Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2; and Rev. i. 10. "Now, put the force of these Scriptures together, and they will certainly amount to the full proof of the institution of this first-day Sabbath. . . . . Put these together, and what more plain and evident proof can a thing of this nature admit of?" (P. 130.)

In treating of the manner of sanctifying the Sabbath, the Bishop discusses the question whether the words "Six days shalt thou labour" be a precept, or a permission only. "To me," says he, "they seem preceptive; . . . for it is said, 'Thou shalt labour,' not only 'Thou mayst labour.'* And those who contend that they merely signify a permission of the daily works of our callings, open too wide a gap for sloth and idleness to creep in without violating any commandment, or being censured and condemned for sin." (P. 132.)

To the objection that, if so, we ought never to leave our labours on any of the six days, and cannot be obliged by human laws to keep any day holy and solemn besides the Sabbath, he answers that the command, "Six days shalt thou labour," is to be understood "with a just restraint and exception; that is, Thou shalt labour six days ordinarily, unless any of them be set apart either by thine own private devotion, or by public authority, for the immediate worship and service of God. And that this is of necessity to be so understood appears, if we consider how many days in the week God himself did dedicate in those feasts which he commanded the Jews strictly to observe, notwithstanding that they were enjoined six days' labour. . . . . And not only did they account themselves obliged to keep these days holy, which were enjoined by Divine command, but those also which were appointed by human authority; and such were the feast of Purim, to be kept two days following, in remembrance of their deliverance from the malicious and bloody designs of Haman (Esth. ix. 21); and the feast of the Dedication of the Temple, first observed at the rebuilding of their temple after their return from the Babylonish Captivity, as you may read, Ezra vi. 16, and from that time perpetuated unto the days of our Saviour Christ, who, though it were but of human and ecclesiastical institution, yet was pleased to honour that solemnity with his presence (John x. 22). Besides, we frequently read of fasts, both personal and national, appointed upon some emergent occasions, to appease and divert the wrath of

* Dr Geddes, however, so translates the phrase,

God; as the fast of the fifth and the seventh month for seventy years together (Zech. vii. 5). And the like to these without doubt, either our own private devotion or the public authority of the nation may in the like circumstances impose on us without violating this command of six days' labour." (P. 133.)

This assertion by a High Church prelate, of the duty of keeping other holy days than the Sabbath, in obedience to mere human authority, seems to imply that even in the absence of a divine command to keep the Sabbath, he would have considered it a Christian duty to obey the ecclesiastical and civil laws "imposing on us" its observance.

He next considers the question, Whether we are as strictly obliged as the Jews were, to abstain from work on the Sabbath? His answer is, that we are not: "For we are bound to nothing by the law of Moses, but only what was of moral and natural right in that law; and as for other ordinances which were positive, we are set free from them by that liberty which Jesus Christ hath purchased for, and conferred upon, his Church. We do not celebrate the Lord's Day itself upon any obligation laid upon us by the letter of this Fourth Commandment (for that expressly enjoins the seventh day from the creation, whereas ours is the eighth), but only from the analogy and proportion of moral reason; which requires that a due and convenient portion of our time should be separated to the service and worship of God. But, for the fixing of the very day, why it should be this rather than any other, we acknowledge it to proceed from the consecration of it by our Saviour's resurrection, the institution of the Apostles, and the consequent practice of the Universal Church of Christ in all ages, as I have already declared. And therefore should we as scrupulously and nicely observe it in all circumstances as the Jews did their Sabbath, possibly it would not be a sanctification of the Sabbath, but a fond and groundless superstition. The Lord's Day is therefore to be observed, as only in things that are in themselves moral and rational: Nor will this give any scope to the libertinism of those who would willingly indulge themselves either in worldly affairs or loose recreations on this day. For it is moral and rational that the whole of that day which is set apart for the worship of God should be employed in his worship. This, likewise, is moral, and of spiritual obligation, that we do not our own pleasure, nor speak our own words on his holy day, as the prophet expresseth it (Isa. lviii. 13). This obligeth us Christians as well as the Jews. For if a day be dedicated unto God, certainly every part and parcel of it belongs unto him; and we ought to rest from all our worldly employments that might steal away our thoughts and affections from God, or indispose us to his spiritual worship and service. But yet this extends not to these small punctualities of gathering sticks, kindling a fire, and preparing food for ourselves; for these things, doubtless, may be done, without being any moral impediments to our piety and devotion on this day: yea, they may be moral helps and furtherances unto it." (P. 134.)

On this it may be remarked, that as employments which hinder the devotion and piety of one man may leave undiminished, or even be helps to, the piety of another whose dispositions and mode of life are different, it follows that no general rule is applicable to all, and that Christians ought to be less addicted than they are to judging one another in respect to the employment of the Lord's Day—especially as it may happen that the censured persons have failed, after due investigation, to attain conviction that the Fourth Commandment imposed on the Jews any duty beyond that of resting from work on the seventh day.

188. CHAFIE, THOMAS, *Minister of Nutshelling*.—A Brief Tract on the Fourth Commandment. Wherein is discovered the Cause of all our Controversies about the Sabbath-Day, and the means of reconciling them. More particularly is shewed, 1. That the seventh day from the Creation, which was the day of God's Rest, was not the seventh day which God in this Law commanded his People to keep holy; neither was it such a kind of day as was the Jews' Sabbath-Day. 2. That the seventh day in this Law commanded to be kept holy is the seventh day of the week, viz., the day following the six days of labour with all People. 3. That Sunday is with Christians as truly the Sabbath-Day, as was Saturday with the Jews. Recommended by the Rev. Dr Bates and Mr John How. Lond. 1692. 4to. Pp. 74.

The views here propounded by Mr Chafie resemble those of Dr Homes (No. 164); whose predecessor and not follower he was, if the present treatise was originally published, as it appears to have been, in 1652. I have, however, seen only the later edition. The work is very elaborate, especially in regard to the astronomical aspects of the question.

189. BAMPFIELD, THOMAS.—An Enquiry whether the Fourth Commandment be repealed or altered. Lond. 1692. 4to.

The opinions of the Seventh-day Baptists are advocated by this writer, who probably was a relation of Francis Bampfield the author of two works previously published on the same side (*Nos.* 163 and 169). I have failed to discover anything concerning him, beyond the fact mentioned by his opponent Dr Wallis, who seems to have known him personally—that he was not a professional

theologian, but a counsellor-at-law. (Wallis, Part II., p. 1.) His *Enquiry* is so scarce that I have nowhere been able to find it; but as Wallis quotes him largely and with every appearance of fairness, I borrow from the latter the following summary of his positions, expressed as nearly as possible in the language used by himself. He maintains, "that from the beginning of the world, as ancient as the creation, before the entrance of sin and the fall of man, our Lord Jesus Christ, our Mediator and Redeemer, did observe, institute, bless, and sanctify the seventh day, and that this doth include the seventh day of every week afterwards in a continual succession or circulation of days and weeks, and no other weekly day then or since consecrated or observed as holy, but the seventh day only; and not only *a* seventh day, but *the* seventh day (in a continued course from the first creation), and no other day of the week so long as the world lasts; to Gentiles as well as Jews; and this to begin always at sunset; and that this was thenceforth observed continually, even to this day, and the memory thereof (that we may not be at a loss to know which is the day) transmitted continually from father to son, and this tradition never interrupted or forgotten either before or since our Saviour's time." (See Wallis, Part II., p. 107.)

The most remarkable of his assertions is, that the Saturday-Sabbath was observed in England till the reign of Edward VI., when, according to him, the first act of Parliament for the observance of the Lord's Day was passed. This preposterous statement was amply refuted by Bishop Stillingfleet, in an address to his clergy in 1696, as mentioned above, p. 9. It further appears that Bampfield contends against the practice of attending public worship oftener than once on the Sabbath-day.

In the articles on Wallis's two works (Nos. 190 and 193), farther indications will be found of the opinions of Bampfield.

190. WALLIS, JOHN, D.D., *Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford* (*born* 1616; *died* 1703).—A Defence of the Christian Sabbath. Part the First. In answer to a treatise of Mr Thomas Bampfield pleading for Saturday Sabbath. Oxford, 1692. 4to. Pp. 85.

A second edition was published in 1693. Both this treatise and the second part are probably included in his collected works, published at Oxford in 1693–99; 3 volumes folio.

Wallis was an eminent mathematician, and one of the earliest and most active members of the Royal Society. When thirty years of age he acted as one of the scribes or secretaries of the Westminster Assembly; an employment which doubtless led to the publication of his *Brief and Easy Explanation of the Shorter Catechism* (8th edition, Lond. 1662, 8vo, pp. 50). At the same period he

would naturally become interested in the Sabbath controversy, and familiar with its details. Notwithstanding his connection with the Assembly, he favoured the royal cause, and at the Restoration became a chaplain in ordinary to the king. The opinions expressed in his writings against Bampfield agree in the main with those of the Assembly. Although in general he evinces the usual tendency of mathematicians to doubt whatever in the position of an opponent has not been *proved*, he is easily satisfied with the evidence commonly brought from the New Testament for the transference of the Sabbath to the first day of the week.

Several quotations from this First Part are here subjoined :—

"I do not know, and I believe no man living can tell me, whether what we now call Sunday be a first, a second, a third, or a seventh day, in a continued circulation of weeks from the creation. And what it is impossible for me to know, I think will be no crime to be ignorant of. Nor hath this author any other way than common tradition (on which he is not willing that we should lay weight), whereby to guess which is the first or which is the seventh day, in such a circulation of weeks, either from the creation, or even from Christ's time.

"I am sufficiently satisfied that we ought to keep a Sabbath, that is, a day of holy rest, after six days of ordinary labour, according to the Fourth Commandment; and this in a continued course of circulation. But I am not certain, nor can I be, which is a first or a seventh day in such a circulation of weeks from the creation; and therefore shall content myself to observe that day which I find observed in the church where I live. In old England I observe the Sabbath which here I find; and if I were in New England, I would observe the Sabbath which I find observed there. Though I think it may be disputable whether they and we may be said to observe the same day (the first meridian passing between them and us). And yet I would not advise to have it changed in either.

"Now, I can hardly think that God hath laid the great stress of so weighty a point (as whereon the main of God's public worship doth much depend) on such a circumstance as is impossible for us to know, and of which we may be modestly ignorant.

"I should rather think that what Christ says of the place, John iv. 21–23, 'The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem worship the Father, but the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth,' is in good measure true of the time also. And, as it is not so material whether in this or that place God be worshipped, so he be worshipped aright; so neither is it so material whether on this or that day, as that a Sabbath or day of holy rest be duly kept." (Pp. 1, 2.)

"Nor do I find any footsteps in history that any other nation but the Jews did, for many ages after this time [*i.e.* the exodus], so much as measure out their time by weeks.

"I know that many learned and pious men have been searching to that purpose, and willing to lay hold on anything that might

seem to look that way. And I should be well enough pleased to see it made out. But I have not seen anything convictive to give me satisfaction therein.

"I have consulted Clemens Alexandrinus, and what he cites in the fifth book of his 'Stromata,' who hath, I believe, made the best search of any into heathen writers for that purpose. His design in that book is to show that the heathens had stolen or borrowed much of their philosophy from what he calls Philosophia Barbara or Barbarorum, meaning thereby the Jewish learning (for, with the Greeks, all but themselves were barbarians). And, amongst many other things, he takes notice of the number seven, sometimes mentioned in heathen writers as with some veneration, which he thinks to be occasioned from that number oft mentioned in the sacred writers, and particularly from that of their Sabbath, and measuring their time by weeks. But he doth not at all intimate as if himself did think the heathens so to have divided their time, or to keep that Sabbath, but only that they were acquainted with the Jewish learning, and borrowed much of theirs from thence.

"That which therein seemed to me the most promising (and by others also is oft alleged) was that cited from Hesiod, *καὶ ἑβδόμη ἱερὸν ἦμαρ* ('the seventh a sacred day.') But when I consulted the place in Hesiod, in his *Ἔργα καὶ ἡμέραι* (in the latter part of which he treats of days), I find nothing there of weeks, or days of the week, but only days of the month. For it is this he there proposeth to speak of, *τριηκάδα μηνὸς* ('the thirty days of the month'), on which he makes divers remarks; as, which of them were to be accounted good days, and which bad days, and for what purposes. And begins with these,—

Πρῶτον, ἔνη, τετράς τε, καὶ ἑβδόμη, ἱερὸν ἦμαρ,
Τῇ γὰρ Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσάορα γείνατο Λητώ.

('Begin we with the first, and the fourth, and the seventh, the sacred day, because that on this day Apollo, who hath the golden sword, was born of Latona.' So that, it seems, the seventh day, not the first, was then Sunday. (For Apollo with his gold sword is but another name for the Sun.) But it was the seventh day of the month, not the seventh day of the week (for of weeks he there says nothing). And he then goes on to speak of the eighth and ninth days; then of the eleventh and twelfth, next of the thirteenth, and so of other days of the month; showing which of them were accounted lucky days, and which unlucky, and for what affairs. But nothing of weeks at all. . . . .

"Nor do I find anything that is more to the purpose in all there cited by Clemens Alexandrinus than this of Hesiod. But if any where he could have found that the heathens divided their time by weeks, no doubt but he would have mentioned this as borrowed from the Jewish learning (which was the thing he was there inquiring after). And when he saith nothing of it, we may be sure he could not find it. I find, indeed, that some of the heathens

(as Persius and Lucian) do laugh or jeer at the Jewish Sabbath ('recutitaque Sabbata pallent') and therefore did know of the Jewish Sabbath; but not that they did observe it, or so much as divide their time by weeks." (Pp. 5, 6.)

Again: "It is not necessary that we have express words of command recorded. We have no record in Scripture of such express words of command for the seventh-day Sabbath, till after Israel's coming out of Egypt; nor for the worshipping of God by sacrifice; nor for other things which yet were duties before any record of such express words of command. It is enough if we can otherwise collect it to be God's will, according to the best light we have.

"If this gentleman think himself obliged to keep the Jewish Sabbath also, this doth not hurt us. This, I think, was the case of the Christian Jews at first. I do not much question but that they did, as other Christians, observe the Lord's Day. The doubt was, whether they were not to observe also the Jewish Sabbath, as before they did. And these believers who were yet zealous of the law, and thought themselves obliged, together with Christianity, to observe the law of Moses, did no doubt think themselves equally obliged to the Jewish Sabbath. Those who thought themselves obliged to be baptized, and to be circumcised also, thought themselves in like manner obliged to observe the Lord's Day, and also the Jewish Sabbath. And, till they should be better satisfied, the apostles permit the Jews so to do.

"If this do not satisfy him, I have yet two expedients for him:—

"Let him begin his week on Monday, and then Sunday will be the seventh day. Whether the seventh in course from the creation I cannot tell, nor can any man living inform me; but it will at least be the seventh day of his week.

"2. If he be not satisfied with this, my next expedient is thus: Let him take a voyage round the world, as Sir Francis Drake did; going out of the Atlantic Ocean westward by the Straits of Magellan to the East Indies, and then from the east returning by the Cape of Good Hope (the usual way) homeward; and take with him as many as please of those who are of his mind. And let them keep their Saturday-Sabbath all the way. When they come home to England, they will find their Saturday to fall upon our Sunday: and they may thenceforth continue to observe their Saturday-Sabbath on the same day with us. Which is the second expedient.

"If you ask, how this can be? I will make it very plain, that so it will be, and so it must be. For supposing the earth to be round, and the sun moving from east to west, you must allow that it comes sooner to the eastern parts than to the western. It will sooner be noon in Holland than in England, and sooner here than in Ireland.

"If you ask, how much sooner? We say, that fifteen degrees of longitude westward makes it an hour later. As if he embark about Dover, Yarmouth, or other port on the east side of England, and

sail as far westward as the west of Ireland, or a little farther, it will be an hour later, and not be noon there till it be one o'clock at the place where he embarked. And so in proportion, an hour for every fifteen degrees. And accordingly, when he hath gone round the whole circle of three hundred and sixty degrees (that is, four-and-twenty times fifteen), it will be later by four-and-twenty hours; that is, it will be but Saturday noon with him, when it is Sunday noon with those who staid here; that is, his Saturday will be our Sunday. And thenceforth his Saturday-Sabbath will be the same day with our Sunday-Sabbath ever after.

"And this, I think, should fully satisfy him. For he tells us, p. 39, 'The variety of the time of the sun-rising or setting in different climates doth no way disturb; for that a day longer or shorter is still a day, and but a day.'

"Most certain it is he who shall have thus sailed round the world will have had one day fewer than those who staid here. So it was with Sir Francis Drake and his company: And so it hath been with all who have taken such a voyage (as many have done, for it is not a rare case); and so will be to any who shall so do.

"What he would resolve upon this case, or what he thinks Sir Francis Drake was to do when this happened, I cannot tell.

"If he would go on to reckon the days according as they had happened to him in his voyage, then this expedient must fully satisfy him; for then he keeps his Saturday-Sabbath on our Sunday.

"If he thinks the account should be rectified when or before he comes home, and call the days thenceforth as he finds those to do that staid here, what shall become of that day he hath lost? and which day of the week shall he reckon that to be?

"And when must he rectify that account? when he comes home, or somewhere by the way?" (Pp. 78-80.)

Wallis argues, p. 23, that in the time of Christ the Jews reckoned their days, not from sunset to sunset, but, in accordance with the Roman custom, from midnight to midnight. Two passages, however, Mark i. 32, and Luke iv. 40, seem to militate against this unusual view. (See above, i. 56, 61, and note * on p. 57.) The Evangelists, who wrote for Gentile as well as Jewish readers, may have sometimes accommodated their language to those accustomed to the Roman way of reckoning.

191. BAMPFIELD, THOMAS (*see No.* 189).—A Reply to Dr Wallis his Discourse concerning the Christian Sabbath. Lond. 1693. 4to. Pp. 80.

There is a copy of this Reply in the Bodleian Library, but I have not seen it.

192. MARLOW, ISAAC.—A Tract on the Sabbath Day.

Wherein the keeping of the First Day of the Week a Sabbath is justified by a Divine Command and a Double Example contained in the Old and New Testament. With Answers to the chiefest Objections made by the Jewish Seventh-day Sabbatharians and others. Lond. 169¾. 4to. Pp. 87.

The institution of the Sabbath at the beginning is here maintained; while the Fourth Commandment is regarded as having been "for the use of the Gentiles," as well as the Israelites, in as far as it was the substance of the law of nature. The author thinks with Chafie that Sunday was observed by the ancient Gentiles, and that this was probably the seventh day in order from the creation.

193. WITSIUS, HERMAN, *a learned Calvinistic Theologian, Professor of Divinity at Leyden* (*born* 1636; *died* 1708).—De Œconomia Fœderum Dei cum Hominibus. Traject. 1694. 4to.

There is an English translation by William Crookshank, D.D. It was published last century, and has been several times reprinted, the last edition being in 2 vols. 8vo, Lond. 1837. It is entitled, "The Economy of the Covenants between God and Man."

In Book i. ch. vii., where he treats of "the First Sabbath," Witsius interprets the "resting" of God on the seventh day as meaning that He not only desisted from creating new species of creatures, but "*acquiesced* and *took complacency*" in his finished work. And it is further supposed that He set this his resting before man as a pattern by which he should be taught to acquiesce in nothing but God, whose glorification should be his sole pleasure; and that He *sanctified* the seventh day by commanding it to be employed by man for that sacred work, adding a promise, that all that time thus employed by man should be highly *blessed* to him. A large portion of the chapter is occupied in refuting the hypothesis of Walker (see above, p. 38, note), which some learned Dutch contemporary of Witsius had adopted; viz., "that Adam, on the very day of his creation, being seduced by the devil, had involved himself and the whole world in the most wretched bondage of corruption; but that God on the seventh day restored all things thus corrupted by the devil and by man, by his gracious promise of the Messiah: upon this restoration he rested upon that very day; and that rest, upon the reparation of the world, being peculiar to the seventh day, may be the foundation of the Sabbath." (§ 19.) These notions seem to be now without advocates in any Christian sect.

In Book iv. ch. iv. the Decalogue is considered, and the question as to the perpetuity and universality of its obligation discussed. The author says:—

"It has been formerly, and is to this day a matter of dispute in the church, whether the laws of the two tables, as they were given to the people of Israel by Moses, are of perpetual obligation, and extend even to us Christians. Hieronymus Zanchius, *Operum* tom. iv. lib. 1, c. 11, maintains at large, and by several arguments, that we Christians have nothing to do with the moral precepts, as they were given to the Israelites by Moses; but only in so far as they agree with the law of nature, common to all nations, and confirmed by Christ, whom we acknowledge to be our King. And Musculus writes to the same purpose, *Loc. Commun. de abrogatione legis Mosaicæ.* But while David Pareus gives his opinion about the opposite opinions of Dominicus a Soto and Bellarmine, the former of whom denied that we are subject to the law of the Decalogue as it was delivered by Moses, but the latter, on the contrary, maintained that the law, as given by Moses, was also binding on us, though he premises (*ad libri Bellarmini de justificatione* iv. c. 6) that it is of small importance to dispute about the ministry of Moses by which the law was formerly promulgated, provided the law, and the obedience thereof, be in vigour or force in the church; yet he says that Bellarmine's opinion is to be retained as the safer and more preferable. Rivet, *in Explicat. Decalog.*, thinks that the difference is not in the thing, but in the manner of expression: for all agree, that all the moral duties contained in the law are of perpetual observance among Christians, in so far as they are natural precepts, imprinted on the minds of all by God, the author of nature; and as by way of instruction they are contained in the written laws, they are a great, nay a necessary help to our weakness and ignorance. Yet he rather seems to incline to the sentiment of Zanchius and Musculus. We shall comprehend our own opinion in the following positions.

"1. Seeing the Decalogue contains the sum of the law of nature, and, as to its substance, is one and the same therewith, so far it is of perpetual and universal obligation. And thus far all divines are agreed, the Socinians themselves not excepted. See Volkel. lib. iv. c. 5.

"2. We are not only to perform the duties which it requires, because they are agreeable to reason; and to abstain from the contrary vices, because reason declares them to be base and vile; but also under this formal notion—because God has enjoined those duties, and prohibited those vices; that his authority as lawgiver, may be acknowledged, and our goodness have the nature of an obedience; which, as such, is founded on the alone authority of him who commands. And who can doubt, that it is the duty of a rational creature to acknowledge God as his supreme Lord and Governor, to whose will, without any further examination, he ought to submit, saying, 'Lord, what wouldst thou have me to do?'

"3. The Gentiles, who had heard nothing of the giving of the law in the wilderness, were not bound to the observance of that law, as it was published to the Israelites, but only as inscribed on their own consciences. Hence the apostle says, 'that as many as

have sinned without law,' namely, the written law, 'shall also perish without law,' Rom. ii. 12; that is, shall not be condemned in consequence of the law, as delivered to Israel in writing, but of the violation of the natural law. However, if any of the Gentiles came to have any knowledge of the giving of this law, they were to believe that the precepts of it were spoken to them no less than they were to Israel; nor could they neglect them without throwing contempt on God, and incurring the forfeiture of salvation.

"4. Though the precepts of common honesty, in some special manner, and with some particular circumstances, were originally appointed for a peculiar people, yet they are still binding by a divine authority on all those who come to know that God formerly enjoined them to their neighbours. For instance, what Paul wrote to the Romans, is no less binding on us than it was on them; because the obligation is founded on the manifestation or discovery of the divine will and pleasure. When, therefore, God has said to any particular person, that this or that duty is incumbent upon him as a rational creature, who ought to bear a resemblance to the divine image; all other men who hear this are as much bound to that duty, as he to whom it was first proposed; not only because they apprehend the matter of that precept to be consonant to reason; but also, because the command was given by God, no matter to whom it was given at first.

"5. Common precepts, which bind all to whom they are made known, on account of the authority of him who enjoins them, may be pressed upon some by certain peculiar reasons. For instance, the precept concerning constancy in the faith of the gospel, might be pressed on Jews and Gentiles from different motives, and yet the precept remain common to both. Thus when God published the Decalogue to the Israelites, he annexed some reasons, which, to the latter, were peculiar to them alone; because, what was a common duty to all, he was pleased in an especial manner to recommend to them. Yet in his wisdom he published those reasons in such a manner as to concern others also, by way of analogy, and in their mystical signification.

"6. As the people of Israel constituted the church at that time, and as Jesus Christ the Son of God, and King of the church, prescribed the Decalogue to them, it follows that the same law retains its force in the church, till it be abrogated again by the King of the church. We are not to think that the church of the Old Testament, which consisted of Israelites, and that of the New, though for the greatest part made up of Gentiles, were a quite different people. They ought to be looked upon as one kingdom of Christ, who made *both one;* Eph. ii. 14, and who graffed us, when wild olives, into that fat olive, Rom. xi. 17. And consequently, the laws which were once given to the church by Christ the King, are always binding on the whole church, unless Christ shall declare, that he has abrogated them by some other institution. But it is absurd to imagine, that Christ abrogated the moral law in so far as he gave it by the mediation of Moses to the church of Israel, and directly confirmed

the same law to the Christian church. For seeing it is the same law, of the same King, in one and the same kingdom, though that kingdom is enriched with new accessions and new privileges; why should we suppose it abrogated and ratified again almost in the same breath? Nay, many considerations persuade us to believe that the law of the Decalogue was given to the church in order to be a perpetual rule, from the manner in which it was given.

"For, as these commandments were published before the assembly of the whole church, in the hearing of all, while the other precepts were given to Moses alone in his sacred retirement; as they were engraved on tables of stone by the finger of God, to the end that, as Calvin remarks, this doctrine might remain in perpetual force; and seeing they, and they alone, were put in the ark of the covenant, under the wings and guardianship of God himself, God plainly shewed by so many prerogatives, that the reason of those precepts was far different from that of the others, which were only imposed on the church for a time. . . . .

"We may add, that Christ has declared, 'he was not come to destroy, but to fulfil the law' (Matt. v. 17). To destroy, signifies there, to abrogate, and to free men from the obligation of it, as appears from ver. 19. But that Christ speaks of the law of the Decalogue, we gather from what follows, where he explains the precepts of that law, and recommends them to his disciples. And when Paul, Rom. xiii. 9, and James, chap. ii. 8, 11, inculcate the precepts of the law on Christians, in the same terms in which they were delivered by Moses to Israel, they do not insist upon this consideration, that they were agreeable to the dictates of right reason, or were ratified again by Christ, but that they were thus formerly published and written by God. Nay (Eph. vi. 2), the apostle not only insists on the promise that was annexed to the fifth commandment, but also on the order of the precepts, recommending honour or regard to parents from this argument, that this is *the first commandment with promise*. But if the Decalogue, as it was formerly delivered to the church of Israel, did not concern Christians, that argument of the apostle (which be it far from us to say) would have no force with Christians.

"Finally, if the Decalogue, as it was formerly given to the church, was not now binding on the same, it must necessarily have been revoked by God, and abrogated by Christ; both which is absurd. For who will be so bold as to suppose God to speak in this manner:—'It is indeed my will, that you observe those natural precepts, which I formerly commanded the Israelites, in the law that was published with such solemnity; but for the future, I will not have you bound to these, because of my command, but because nature requires it.' And why should Christ abrogate the precepts given to the church of Israel, in order directly to give the very same precepts again to the Christian church? Not to say, that there is not the least sign of any such abrogation in the sacred writings.

"However, we do not refuse, that the law of the covenant of

works was abolished by Christ in its *federal consideration*. 1st, *As to its rigour*, which required of man himself an obedience in every part and degree perfect, as the condition of justification, and that without any promise of the Spirit and of sanctifying grace. 2dly, *As to the curse*, which it threatens against all who deviate from it in the least. And in this sense Paul says, 'that we are not under the law, but under grace' (Rom. vi. 14), though as to its *normal* relation, or as it is the rule of life and manners, it was not even for a moment abrogated or abolished by Christ. 'Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid, yea we establish the law' (Rom. iii. 31). In that respect, Christians are no less under the Decalogue than the Jews were formerly; and that not only because the precepts of it are just and holy, but also because they are commandments which were formerly promulgated with so much majesty and pomp; or, which is almost the very same thing, not only on account of the doctrine they contain, but also of the authority of the supreme governor." (§§ 27–34, 36–38.)

The principle, that moral duties are to be performed, not only because they are agreeable to reason, but *in obedience to the Divine will*, is fully admitted by those who reject the notion that the Decalogue ever bound any but the Jews: the law of nature, partly included in the Decalogue, is, in their estimation, as clearly the law of God to all men, as the Decalogue was to his chosen people. If God had declared to the Jew, as Witsius represents him to have done, "that this or that duty was incumbent on him *as a rational creature*," all must have admitted that the ground would have been strengthened for this writer's opinion, that "if any of the Gentiles came to have any knowledge of the giving of this law, they were to believe that the precepts of it were spoken to them no less than they were to Israel;"—though still the important question would have remained, Whether such Gentiles were bound to bestow upon the evidence of the origin of the Decalogue that careful investigation without which they could never get a rational belief that it *was* the law of God? But in fact there is nothing in the law itself to the effect that any part of it, more than another, obliged the Jews "as rational creatures;" and if it be said that the Gentile was enabled by the light of his reason and conscience to distinguish laws binding all men from those peculiar to the members of the Jewish commonwealth, the reply is obvious,—that since the Gentile is here supposed to recognise by nature the law of God written in the human constitution, he has the same inducement to obey *it*, as to obey corresponding precepts in the Decalogue. "Instead of determining, by an appeal to the law of nature, what precepts of the Jewish law are moral, and then obeying *them* because they agree with the law of nature, we shall find it a shorter and equally effective proceeding to obey the law of nature itself, without encumbering ourselves with intermediate rules, which were never prescribed to any but the Jews. The circuitous process which some think essential, is like setting a steam-engine to turn a mill

by pumping water on the buckets of its wheel, instead of dispensing with the wheel altogether, and connecting the moving power directly with the grinding machinery." (*Sabbath Laws*, p. 223.) Doubtless, as this writer allows (*Id.* p. 196), and as Luther long since taught, much *instruction* is to be gained from judicious study of the law of Moses,—a law wisely adapted to the peculiar circumstances of the people to whom it was given; but also requiring from them, as members of the human race, moral conduct as high as "the hardness of their hearts" allowed the legislator to demand. But we who live in very different times,—who for the most part have little knowledge of oriental usages and circumstances, and are apt to forget the peculiarities of the Jewish people,—ought to be careful lest we misapply to mankind at large what was never meant to serve even as an *example* to the Gentiles, but on the contrary might be designed to keep up the separation between the Jews and them. The error of supposing that the Mosaic law against taking interest for money was binding on the modern Gentiles prevailed till the seventeenth century; the burning of witches was thought by our forefathers at the same period to be a Christian duty; and Knox himself maintained, on the ground of the Mosaic law, that the civil governors of Scotland, and their subjects in case of neglect, were bound to extirpate the opinions and worship of the Roman Catholics, and even to massacre the members of that Church—man, woman, and child. (*Edin. Rev.* xxvii. 166; and M'Crie's *Life of Knox*, Period viii., p. 278 of 6th ed.) The duty of paying tithes is in like manner held by some even now, to be incumbent not only on the Jews, among whom the priestly tribe of Levi had no share of the land, but for ever on the Gentile Christians, among whom no such arrangement exists, and whose clergy are not priests at all. Yet it is remarkable that some other portions of the Mosaic law, which, whether they bind the Christian or not, may at least suggest to us excellent rules of conduct, have in general been overlooked by the spiritual instructors of the people. In Deut. xxiii. 12-14, for example, we find an injunction to remove filth out of sight and smell; which precept, it has been said, "there is very great need for inculcating in Scotland, but on which, notwithstanding the reverence of our clergy for the Jewish law, I do not remember to have heard or seen a single sermon." It is but fair to add, however, that of late the clergy of both England and Scotland have begun to direct their attention with very good effect to this and kindred subjects. (See especially *The Observance of the Sanitary Laws, divinely appointed in the Old Testament Scriptures, sufficient to ward off preventable Diseases from Christians as well as Israelites: A Sermon preached in the Cathedral, Manchester, on Sunday Morning, April 30th*, 1854, *by the Rev. Charles Richson, M.A. With Notes by John Sutherland, M.D., of the General Board of Health.* London: Charles Knight. 1854. 8vo. Pp. 35. Also, *What Christianity Teaches respecting the Body: A Sermon preached in the Parish*

Church, Crathie, 11th Oct. 1857, *by Robert Lee, D.D.* Edinburgh: Cowan & Co. 1857. 8vo. Pp. 31.) Mr Richson thinks, that, "due regard being had to the mere connection of the Mosaic sanitary regulations with ceremonials now abolished, or with typical indications of the Saviour's offices, and to the adaptation of such regulations to the peculiarities of climate, there is nothing in the Gospel dispensation which abrogates the sanitary system prescribed in the Mosaic institutions; but that, proceeding, like the moral law, from God himself, it is so far binding upon the Christian as upon the Jew, that neither the moral nor the sanitary law can be neglected without offence to Almighty God." (P. 27.) This conclusion may be readily assented to, even by those who consider the moral and sanitary laws to bind the Gentiles only as natural or as Christian laws, and in no manner or degree because they were delivered by Moses.

It is urged by Witsius, in the passage above quoted, that "what Paul wrote to the Romans is no less binding on us than it was on them; because the obligation is founded on the manifestation or discovery of the Divine will and pleasure." But even if this be granted, does it follow, that because the duties which Paul as an apostle of Christ inculcated on a Christian church are binding on Christians at large, the duties which Moses prescribed to the Jews are more or less binding on the Gentiles? Again, the interpretation which Witsius gives of Rom. xi. 17, is by no means borne out by the conduct of the apostle himself, who, so far from inculcating obedience to the law of Moses by the Gentile converts, was in fact a strenuous opponent of the Judaizing Christians. Neither Paul nor the other apostles drew a distinction between different portions of the law; and nothing could be more natural, than that, in writing to Jewish Christians, they should often impress their admonitions by referring to the moral precepts of that law which was still regarded as binding on the house of Israel. But it remains to be considered, whether they have ever appealed to the Jewish law as anywise binding on the Gentile Christians; for unless this question can be affirmatively answered, nothing to the purpose is determined in favour of the Puritan view, or even of the narrower doctrine of Witsius. This subject is fully and ably discussed by the Rev. Baden Powell, in his *Christianity without Judaism*, Essay III., On the Law and the Gospel. See also above, i. 79, 201, 244; ii. 30, 36; and Dr Wardlaw's *Discourses on the Sabbath*, Disc. II.

The distinction made by Witsius between the Decalogue and the rest of the Mosaic law, in regard to its binding power over Christians, is repudiated by Hengstenberg in his treatise on *The Lord's Day* (p. 89 of Martin's translation). He regards "the spiritual element" *of the whole law* as obligatory on all men; but not its "temporal form,"—to which, "only that can belong, which can be proved from the nature of the theocracy to refer especially to it." And certainly it does not seem to follow as a necessary conse-

quence from the peculiar solemnity with which the ten commandments were delivered, that they were to be either more extensively or for a longer period binding, than the rest of the law.

The fallacy of the argument of Witsius on this subject, as amplified in Dwight's *Theology*, Serm. 105, has been illustrated thus: "Suppose that William the Conqueror, after establishing his dominion in England, had signalized by an unparalleled blast of trumpets, and by huge bonfires on fifty hills, the promulgation of his first, and (let us say) most important edict to the English people; and had moreover distinguished it from all his future ordinances by engraving it with his royal hand upon brass; would it be 'clear beyond every rational debate,' that this edict, because of such distinction, must have been more *permanently* or *extensively* binding than his other English laws, written on parchment by a scribe, and promulgated in the usual way? Would his subjects in Normandy have thought it 'incredible' that 'he should mark in so solemn a manner this command, unless he intended that all to whom it should come, that is, *all his subjects* '*who should afterward read*' *this law*,' should hold it as being *universally obligatory* throughout his dominions, and consequently binding on the Normans, to whom it was *not* promulgated, equally with the English to whom it *was?* And if any one had told them that the trumpet-blowing, fire-kindling, and engraving on brass, must be 'the result of contrivance and design,' which design *could be no other* than that Normandy as well as England should be subject to this law, would they not have laughed in the face of their instructor, and told him, that although doubtless the king had *some* design in these proceedings, yet, if he had really intended to impose his law upon Normandy as well as England, he would unquestionably have proclaimed it to his Norman subjects, as a law to be obeyed by them; and as for the uncommon solemnity of the English promulgation, *that* was sufficiently accounted for by the obvious utility of arresting, in some such forcible manner, the attention of the English at the commencement of his legislative proceedings, and of fixing as firmly as possible in their memory what was not only the earliest, but the most important ordinance of his reign?"

194. WALLIS, JOHN, D.D. (*see No.* 190).—A Defence of the Christian Sabbath. Part the Second. Being a Rejoinder to Mr Bampfield's Reply to Dr Wallis's Discourse concerning the Christian Sabbath. Oxford, 1694. 4to. Pp. 131.

"There is not," says he, "the least footstep in history, sacred or profane (that I can find), that any nation, much less all nations, did worship the sun upon Sunday more than on any other day, or that any nation before Israel's coming out of Egypt had any weeks

at all; nor any after that time but the Jews only, before the times of Christianity; or that the names of *Saturday*, *Sunday*, *Monday*, &c., were so much as known before that time. And if any of the heathens had any weeks before that time, how shall we know that they were in an uninterrupted circulation from the first creation? So that all this is not so much a tradition, but mere fancy." (P. 55.)

"Whether or no they (the Patriarchs) did then reckon by weeks, is the point in question. That they did then reckon by days, months, and years, we may learn from Gen. i. 14 (which are plainly distinguished by the motions of the sun and moon); but no mention of weeks there nor anywhere else (that I can find) earlier than Exod. xvi., after their coming out of Egypt."* (P. 111.)

He is the earliest writer in whom I have met the observation that "*the* Sabbath" in the authorized English version of Exod. xvi. 23 and 26, ought to be "*a* Sabbath." (P. 113.) See above, i. 8, note. Mr Godfrey Higgins is the only other by whom, as far as I know, these mistranslations have been pointed out. (*Horæ Sabbaticæ*, Part II., § 10.) Wallis states also that "*the* Sabbath," in the English version of the Fourth Commandment, both in Exod. xx. 10 and Deut. v. 14, ought to be "*a* Sabbath;" *Shabbat*, not *Hashabbat*, being the Hebrew word. (P. 114.)

Though willing to believe that the Sabbath was observed before Moses, he is inclined to think that it *was not*, or it was not necessary for us *to know it*. (P. 115.)

He finds in Matt. xxiv. 20, and Acts xiii. 42, express evidence for the Christian Sabbath: "the next Sabbath," in the latter place, he understands to be the *next day* after the Jewish Sabbath. (Pp. 79–82.)

Bampfield had at first argued, as others have often done, that because the word σάββατα (the plural), meaning literally "Sabbaths," is used in Col. ii. 16, the weekly Sabbath cannot be there meant. Wallis, after noticing his subsequent concession that σάββατα is "sometimes" used for *one* Sabbath-day, proceeds to prove from numerous passages of Scripture that "it is not once or twice, but most frequently, so used by the Septuagints (in their Greek translation of the Old Testament, especially of the five books of Moses), whose language the New Testament doth use to follow. . . . . In all the five books of Moses we shall hardly meet with σάββατον in the singular number, but σάββατα in the plural. . . . . And in the New Testament, though the Sabbath be sometimes called σάββατον, it is very often σάββατα, and ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν σαββάτων; and so I take it to be here meant, Col. ii. 16, ἢ σαββάτων, 'or of the Sabbath.'" (Pp. 101, 102.)

195. SMITH, JOHN.—The Doctrine of the Church of England concerning the Lord's Day, or Sunday-Sab-

* He has overlooked Gen. xxix. 27; to which some add Gen. vii. 10; viii. 10, 12.

bath, as it is laid down in the Liturgy, Catechism, and Book of Homilies, vindicated from the vulgar errors of modern writers, and settled upon the only proper and sure Basis of God's Precept to Adam, and Patriarchal Practice. Wherein an Essay is laid down, to prove that the Patriarchal Sabbath, instituted Gen. ii. 3; celebrated by the Patriarchs before the Mosaic Law, and pronounced with the other nine Precepts of the Decalogue from God's own mouth, Exod. xx.; writ by God's finger in stone; deposited in the Ark of the everlasting Covenant, under the inspection of Cherubims, till the rending of the Vail; was the same day of the Week, viz., Sunday, which Christians observe in memory of the perfecting of the Creation of the World by the Redemption of Mankind, celebrated by the Patriarchs in hope of their Resurrection by virtue of Christ's future Resurrection on that day. Lond. 1694. 8vo. Pp. 291.

This book was referred to above, page 45. It differs from Dr Homes's treatise in omitting the hypothesis of a change in the times of beginning and ending the Jewish day. The author's desire is to find the means of vindicating the Church of England from the charge of misleading her members in teaching them the Fourth Commandment (which obviously relates to the seventh day, whereon God rested from his work), as a precept binding upon Christians. He laments that while, on the one hand, some saw no higher ground for the sanctification of the Lord's Day than for Church holidays in general, others, alarmed by this equal ranking, had been drawn by their zeal for the Sabbath to the very brink, if not into the gulf, of Judaizing in their manner of celebrating the Lord's Day. "The first error," says he, "in the digestion of men's thoughts touching this controversy, is the common hypothesis of all modern litigants, to wit, that the Lord's Day comes in as successor in the room of Saturday; upon which sandy ground it is not so easy to lay any solid foundation for sanctifying the Lord's Day. For if that day which God by his example and precept first sanctified for the weekly Sabbath be Saturday, that day cannot be unsanctified, and another day adopted in its room, but by an equal, if not a superior authority to that which consecrated Saturday. Now, a superior authority to the example and precept of God cannot be imagined; and that which is alleged by either party for the unsanctifying Saturday falls far short of equality to it. For what argumentative force can there be in Christ's rising, his appearing to his Apostles, the Apostles' assembling on Sundays, for the

111643

sanctifying that day, comparable to the express command of God for sanctifying Saturday? Much less can the constitution of the Church counterbalance it. Briefly, they proclaim Sunday an usurping intruder into the privileges of Saturday, rather than its legal successor, who advance it into the possession of Saturday's crown (to be the weekly holy day) upon no better claim than can possibly be deduced for it while they make it a younger brother." (Pref.)

To obviate this disadvantage, he maintains that the Saturday-Sabbath, with its *ceremonial rest*, was assigned to the Jews to distinguish them from other nations (whose duty and practice he holds it to have been to observe Sunday as a day of worship, though no further as a day of rest from work than as rest was needed for the performance of religious exercises); that, during the Jewish dispensation, the Lawgiver was pleased to dispense with the observance, by his chosen people, of the primeval and general holy-day; and that when the Mosaic law was ended in Christ, the Jews became once more bound, as the Gentiles had always been, to devote the first day of the week to religious exercises, and to abstain on it from such labour as hindered the performance of the duties of piety.

"That this hypothesis," says he, "yields a solid ground for the conscientious observing the Lord's Day, so as there needs not any new constitution be made by Christ or his Apostles for the observing of it, is manifest of itself. For if Sunday be the day that God separated at first to be the weekly Sabbath to the patriarchs, and was accordingly celebrated by them before the giving of the law by Moses, the standing part of the Fourth Command, obliging all mankind, must necessarily refer to that; and that there is a standing part of that precept, for the breach whereof we are taught to say, 'Lord have mercy upon us,' and for the better observing whereof we are taught to pray, 'Incline our hearts to keep this law,' is the declared judgment of our Church. And then the temporary and ceremonial part, both as to the day and mode of keeping it, peculiar to the Jews, being part of those carnal ordinances that were imposed upon them until the time of reformation (Heb. ix. 10), vanish of themselves, as being antiquated by Christ's cross, and give way to the ancient patriarchal Sabbath. And here now our Saviour's rising from the dead, his frequent appearing to his disciples on Sunday, the practice of the Apostles and primitive Church, come in seasonably with their auxiliary force to strengthen my hypothesis, and to support the Divine institution of the Lord's Day." (Pref.). "For what greater influence could our Saviour's rising upon that day have upon Sunday, to the sanctifying thereof, than his Passion on Good Friday or his Ascension on Holy Thursday could have upon either of those days, towards the sanctifying either of them for the weekly Sabbath, in abstraction from God's resting thereon, and his command to us to rest after his example on Sunday; seeing Christ may be said to have entered into his rest on Holy Thursday as

well, if not rather, than on Easter day, but that our Saviour chose to rise on Sunday, which God had sanctified from the beginning? And therefore his resurrection, and the Apostles' assembling on that day, though they are not of authority sufficient to institute a new Lord's Day, yet they are safe guides to conduct us to that old patriarchal Lord's Day whereon the Lord rested, and commanded the Church Catholic to sanctify." (P. 126.) "This secures us from falling into Jewish superstition in the manner of celebrating our Christian Sabbath; for with the Jewish day the Jewish manner of keeping that day vanisheth: so that the Christian Church is not obliged to sanctify the Lord's Day in those strict formalities of bodily rest and other carnal observances imposed upon the Jews, but in the more generous and man-becoming exercises of contemplating the glory of God in the creation, completed by the new creation of believing, acquiescing, and triumphing in God through Christ; of attending on gospel ordinances, public, private, and secret; of visiting the sick, relieving the indigent, and eating our bread with gladness of heart on that day above others; that being the Christian weekly festival, and the day which God hath made for us to be glad and rejoice in." (Pref.)

In support of his hypothesis, Mr Smith argues that the patriarchal church had solemn stated assemblies for public worship, because they had stated places (Gen. xii. 8; xiii. 4; xxviii. 17–22); separate persons and maintenance, in order to the administration of such worship (Gen. iv. 3; xiv. 18; xxviii. 22; xli. 45; xlvii. 22; Exod. iii. 1; xviii. 12; Heb. xi. 4); and stated weekly times when to assemble (Gen. i. 14; iv. 3; xxix. 27; Judg. xiv. 12, 15, 17; Job i. 6; ii. 1.) He further affirms that the computation of time by weeks was common in all ages, and to all nations; a fact to be inferred, he thinks, from the transcendent encomiums given by Hesiod, Homer, Linus, and other Gentile writers, to "the seventh day," by which phrase, for the reasons assigned by Dr Homes (above, p. 43), he understands them to have meant Sunday. And the custom of reckoning by periods of seven days not being derivable from any other source imaginable to him than God's resting on the seventh day and sanctifying it, the conclusion is thought unavoidable, that weeks were divinely instituted.

But the evidence chiefly relied on is "the vast disparity betwixt the fourth precept, Exod. xx., and Deut. v.," especially in the reasons on which they are grounded. For whereas the former enjoins an observance in commemoration of the creation, which, says he, is common to all persons in all ages and places; the latter was grounded, in respect to the specification of the day, upon a reason peculiar to the Jews—their rest from Egyptian bondage; it was a mark of the peculiar covenant made with them (Deut. xxix. 1); and it appointed that which was to serve as a memorial of their deliverance, and as a *sign* to discriminate them from all other nations (Exod. xxxi. 13; Deut. iv. 20), which the

observance of Saturday could not have been if those other nations had reckoned that day holy. As the weekly Sabbath of the Jews, no less than their monthly sabbaths, was a shadow of good things to come (Col. ii. 16), the Sabbath of Exod. xx., had *it* been the Jewish Sabbath, must have been abolished when Christ the substance came; but this, says Mr Smith, is contrary to the sense of the Universal Church, which reckons the precept to be one of the Ten Commandments that all Christians are bound to keep. In particular, he understands the Church of England to teach plainly in her Catechism, Liturgy, and Homilies, that the fourth precept, Exod. xx., which she must have intended children and other ignorant persons to understand in *the plain literal sense*, is still in full force as a law of God. But to what day, he asks, does she apply the Commandment? Evidently to Sunday. For, "What transgression of the fourth precept is it that we fly to mercy for the forgiveness of? Is it our not sanctifying Saturday? This were a mocking of God, to beg pardon for that we are neither sorry for, nor purpose to forsake. Is it our not sanctifying Sunday as we ought? Doubtless that's the sense of every serious, devout Christian. But then, how comes the profaning of Sunday to be a transgression of the fourth precept, Exod. xx., if that precept do not command the sanctifying of that day?" (Pp. 88, 89.)

This doctrine of the perpetuity of the fourth precept, Exod. xx., is grounded by him likewise on Matt. v. 17. He strongly opposes such as find in this Commandment nothing more specific than the observance of one day in seven; it being manifest to him from its whole tenor, "that that law enjoins the sanctification of *the same precise day* whereon God rested; and therefore," says he, "the crossing out of that cancels the very substance of it, in direct opposition to our Saviour's asseveration, that not one jot or tittle shall fall from the law." (P. 94.) To the argument that the precept is not moral, but only positive, and therefore revocable, he replies: "True, but at the pleasure of the lawgiver only to be revoked." (P. 96.)

He observes that Moses, in Deut. v., not only leaves out the word "Remember," and the reason of the fourth precept in Exod. xx., but assigns another reason; and yet, after all this, declares to the Israelites, "These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount, and he added no more, and he wrote them in two tables of stone." Here, he thinks, the fidelity of Moses can be vindicated "only by this salvo—that the other nine do indifferently appertain to Jew and Gentile, and therefore they are repeated entirely as they came from God's mouth; but the fourth precept for that time did not appertain to the Jews (either as to the day commanded to be sanctified, or the reason of its sanctification, but only in regard of its equity, in respect of the proportion of time), but to all mankind, save the Jews, at all times; and would appertain to the Jews when Christ had made of that twain, Jew and Gentile, one; and therefore Moses, to secure that precept entirely, against that time, sets it down in Exod. xx. word by word as God spake it;

but when he applies that precept to the peculiar state of the Jews at that present, to whom God had, before the promulgation of the law on the holy mount, appointed another day for their weekly Sabbath than that whereon God had rested, it had been ridiculous to have mentioned God's finishing his work of creation in six days, and his resting on the seventh, as the reason why the Jews should rest on that day whereon God wrought; and therefore he omits that, and assigns another reason most proper and cogent, and repeats no more of the precept but what was common to them and other nations. And thus it is true what Moses saith: 'These words the Lord spake in the mount unto your whole assembly, and he added no more;' that is, that you are at present concerned in; and as to the words expressing the reason, God spake them in the preface to the whole Decalogue, as the reason of your being obliged, above other nations, to keep all and every of those laws: And my applying them to the law of the Saturday-Sabbath is a faithful exposition of both the laws concerning the Sabbath, viz., the ceremonial, which concerns you alone, and the moral, so far as it concerns you, that *is*, in the equity of it. He spake, indeed, more words, but not unto your whole assembly in its present constitution, but as you shall be at the rending of the vail. He would have you hear that which I omit to repeat, for that time to come, seeing the pressing of you upon that reason, to keep that Sabbath-day God hath commanded you to observe, would be a strong argument against your keeping it." (Pp. 113–115.)

In this laborious attempt to reconcile the two copies of the Fourth Commandment, Mr Smith, unlike most of the commentators, faces boldly the fact, that in the 5th chapter of Deuteronomy Moses does not *re-enact* the Sabbath-law, with a new reason assigned, but *historically relates* to his countrymen its enactment *at Sinai or Horeb*, and includes in his narrative a *historical repetition* of the Ten Commandments which had been there proclaimed. (See above, vol. i., p. 156.) Holding it to be evident that the seventh day in Exod. xx., and the seventh day in Deut. v., "have different eras" (the former place beginning the account on the first day of the creation, and speaking of the precise day whereon God rested), Mr Smith infers that "the Sabbath, Deut. v., being Saturday, cannot possibly be the seventh, but the sixth in that order, and therefore must, by undeniable consequence, be called the seventh day upon some other account than because God rested thereon from all the works that he had made in the beginning: And whence can the Jewish septimane begin, so as, upon that account, their Saturday is called the seventh day, but from the first day of their gathering quails and manna? (Exod. xvi.) Nor is it called the Sabbath of the Lord because God rested on that day, but because he had given the Jews rest on that day from Egyptian bondage." (Pp. 128–9.)

In Chap. III., which is of great length, the author maintains that the first night's rest which the Israelites had out of Egypt

was Saturday, before the institution of which day for their Sabbath they celebrated Sunday, and profaned Saturday by servile work. In regard to Exod. xvi. he observes, that "the elders that understood not when Moses commanded them to gather a double portion of manna on Friday must have been grown to dotage, if they had been accustomed to rest on Saturday." (P. 145.)

The reason why God appointed Saturday to be the Jewish Sabbath is thought by him to be, that, this being the day immediately preceding Sunday, and the whole economy of Moses's law, as of a thing imperfect, pointing to "good things to come" (Heb. x. 1), it was necessary that their typical day of rest should be so placed "as from thence they might look immediately unto that day of true rest that was to come at the rising of the Sun of Righteousness out of the grave. But besides this, the more special reason of God's appointing them Saturday for their Sabbath was, because Saturday was the first day of rest they had from Egyptian bondage," &c. (P. 220.)

And he conceives that "our Lord's Day, though according to the Jewish idiom it be called the first day (the first day of their week after that God had appointed them to observe another beginning of their week as well as year, than was in use before), yet is in reality the seventh day of the week, commencing that account from the creation, and the same day of the week whereon God rested." (P. 231.)

The duty of observing the Lord's Day, he enforces by the following narrative of a Divine judgment on the salmon-fishers at Berwick:—

"Upon the bringing in the *Book of Sports*, common people began to follow their common callings on Sundays, of which Taylor, in his *Penniless Pilgrimage*, gives this notable instance (of the truth whereof I am very well assured, not only by the report of the inhabitants, but the necessity was laid on this traveller not to lie; for if they who wagered with him could have catcht him therein, he would have had nothing for his travel save the labour). The story is this. When he came to Berwick-upon-Tweed, he found the inhabitants sadly dejected, by reason that the salmon-fishers, upon the publishing of the *Book of Sports*, presuming the next Lord's Day to lay their nets as they used to do on week days, had not since that day, for many weeks, caught one fin (though such incredible numbers of salmon used to come up that river every tide, as I have been credibly informed, that one fishmonger of that town paid many hundred pounds per annum for casks to pickle up salmon in); this they imputed to the hand of God, and sought the removal of this plague by solemn fasting and prayers; upon which, He that hears the cry of the tears of the penitent, took off the prohibition he had laid upon the fish to approach that river, so as the waterpoet at his return found their hearts filled with food and gladness. What might this profanation have come to, if God by miracle had not nipt it in the bud!" (Pp. 258–260.)

196. PFEIFFER, AUGUSTUS, D.D., *a Lutheran Divine, Professor of Oriental Languages at Leipsic* (*born* 1640; *died* 1698).—Opera omnia Philologica. Ultraj. 1704. 2 vols. 4to.

See, in vol. i., Dubia Vexata S. Scripturæ, sive loca difficiliora Veteris Testamenti, Cent. i. Loc. iv.

197. VITRINGA, CAMPEGIUS, *a learned Protestant Divine, Professor of Oriental Languages and Divinity at Francker* (*born* 1659; *died* 1722).—De Synagogâ Vetere libri tres: quibus tum de Nominibus, Structurâ, Origine, Præfectis, Ministris, et Sacris Synagogorum, agitur; tum præcipue, Formam Regiminis et Ministerii earum in Ecclesiam Christianam translatam esse, demonstratur: Cum Prolegomenis. Franeq. 1696. 4to. Pp. 1138.

A condensed translation of this erudite work has been published with the following title: "The Synagogue and the Church: Being an attempt to show that the Government, Ministers, and Services of the Church, were derived from those of the Synagogue. Condensed from the original Latin work of Vitringa, by Joshua L. Bernard, A.M., Curate of St Mary's, Donnybrook. Lond. 1842." 8vo, pp. 262. From that version the subjoined extracts are taken. Mr Bernard states that he "has added some explanatory remarks;" but these are not distinguished in any way from what he found in the original.

Vitringa regards the Fourth Commandment as a law for *rest* merely, and not for any other kind of worship (Book i. Part ii. ch. ii. p. 292). His interpretation of the words *mikra kodesh*, in Lev. xxiii. 3, has already been mentioned above, vol. i. p. 19. He maintains that there is no foundation in Scripture for what Josephus and other Jewish writers affirm as to Moses having appointed assemblies to be held on the Sabbath-day for the reading and hearing of the law (see above, i. 116, 118; ii. 69). Not only is proof wanting, but many facts concur to show that there could not be, in the time of Moses, anything similar to the synagogue. "1. In the entire five books of Moses, there is not one precept, not one injunction, in reference to prayer. There are instances of individuals offering up prayer; there are forms of prayer and thanksgiving; but there is not any one express command enjoining public prayer. 2. We have, recorded, the institution of the priestly office, the separation of the Levites for Divine purposes; and yet the duties of the priests are altogether confined to the tabernacle: and the Levites (instead of being distributed amongst the people, and located in the different cities and villages, for the purpose of mi-

nistering in the various congregations), are ordered to dwell by themselves in forty-eight cities; the cities of the other tribes being, in many instances, far distant from any city of the Levites. Their duties, too, have all reference to the tabernacle, the priests, the sacrifices; without as much as an incidental mention of duties similar to those to be fulfilled in the synagogue. 3. The children of Israel are commanded to hear the law read to them once every seven years (Deut. xxxi. 11, 12). Now, is not this a presumptive argument against the existence of the synagogue, either in the time, or even in the intention of Moses? If there was the weekly reading of the law, where the necessity for reading it once in every seven years at the feast of tabernacles?" (Pp. 30, 31.) Of the words rendered "synagogues of God," in Ps. lxxiv. 8 (above, i. 38, and the note), it is said: "On looking to the original, we shall find that they signify literally, 'the places of meeting God' (*i. e.* the places where Jehovah promised to meet his people), and thus, strictly speaking, are applicable only to the Temple. The Hebrew noun being in the plural number does not interfere with this interpretation; for two plural nouns are used to designate the Temple in this very Psalm, and one of them the noun under consideration." (P. 39.)

"We must, then," it is concluded from the whole discussion, "look for the origin of the synagogue to the times subsequent to the Babylonish captivity; and upon examining the records of these times, we shall find a perfect model of the synagogue, anything like which we in vain seek for in the history of the earlier periods." (ib.) In the eighth and ninth chapters of the book of Nehemiah, "we have a perfect model of the synagogue. 1. The pulpit of wood, elevated above the people. 2. The reading of the law by Ezra and the other doctors. 3. The explanation of the law. 4. Praise and thanksgiving. 5. The people answering, Amen." (Pp. 39–41.) "There are many circumstances which prove that after the Babylonish captivity there was a revival of religion amongst the Jews, and therefore justify us in looking to this period for the origin of the synagogue." (P. 41.) Those enumerated are: 1. The number of copies of the Scriptures in these times (1 Macc. i. 56; xii. 9); 2. The number of scribes (Ezra vii. 6; 1 Macc. vii. 12); and, 3. The public reading of the law (Neh. viii. 18; xiii. 1).

In the chapter where the discourses delivered in the early Christian Church are compared with those delivered in the synagogue, Vitringa notices, among other points of resemblance, that in the former, as in the latter, the discourses were highly allegorical. "Those of our Lord were evidently so; the Epistles of the Apostle Paul prove that this mode of explaining Divine truth was not laid aside by his Apostles; whilst the Epistle of Barnabas, abounding as it does with allegories, gives a fair specimen of the writing, and of course the preaching, usual in these times; and though in all probability Barnabas was not the author of the Epistle, still it is a venerable monument of Christian antiquity; and we may

fairly consider it as a model of ancient writing, and (if men preached as they wrote) of ancient preaching." (P. 196.)

The following passage has a bearing on the arguments of those who see in the prophecies of Isaiah (lvi. 3–8; lxvi. 23) an indication that the Sabbath is an institution of Christianity:—"When the writers of the Old Testament designate the worship of the New Dispensation by expressions borrowed from the worship of their times, it is not that they would have us conclude that the Christian Church was to be in these points similar to the Jewish; no, they used these expressions in order that they might be understood by the people amongst whom they lived: for instance, when Israel was in bondage to the elements of the world, that mode of worship which consisted in the offering of sacrifices was the one chiefly known and received; when, then, the prophets were about to predict that God should be worshipped throughout the whole world, they could not declare such an event to the people of their day more clearly than by some such description as the following:—That sacrifices should be offered by all people; that all nations should go up to Jerusalem to worship the Lord; that Sabbaths, New Moons, and Festal Days, should be observed with all diligence, &c. This way of speaking is simple and natural, and of course merely means that God should be worshipped throughout all the earth with a suitable worship, without any reference to its form. This appears from an evident example: Isaiah and David, when predicting that Christian magistrates would give honour to the Messiah, are accustomed to describe this event by saying, that kings and queens would be in subjection to his kingdom. Now, if any one would infer from this, that the civil polity under the New Dispensation was to be conformable to the form of government of the Jews, he would be far indeed from the mind of the prophets: they merely wished to intimate that the magistrates and princes of the Gentiles would be converted to the religion of Jesus, without any reference to a form of government; and they designated all by the name of kings, because this was the usual form of government amongst Eastern nations. And, similarly, when the prophets predict that 'Sabbaths,' 'New Moons,' 'the Feast of Tabernacles,' shall be observed in the kingdom of Christ (Isa. lvi. 4; lxvi. 23; Zach. xiv. 16); when the Apostle Paul tells us, that 'the Feast of the Passover' is to be kept by Christians (1 Cor. v. 8); they do not mean that the Church of the New Dispensation is to be tied down to the observance of Feasts, and New Moons, and Sabbaths; the Apostle tells us quite the contrary (Heb. iv. 9, 11, 16; Col. ii, 16). Such expressions mean that the Church of the New Dispensation should worship God, with a worship similar in kind, but not in form, to that which was offered to him on Sabbaths, New Moons, &c. Thus the Sabbath was intended for rest; the New Moons and Festivals were consecrated to joy and gladness—the former in thanksgiving to Jehovah as the true Author of light; the latter in remembrance of various mercies conferred upon the Jewish nation. But now that the Church is to keep a constant rest from sin and evil deeds; now

that she praises God, and rejoices in him, as the Author of spiritual light and the bestower of all spiritual mercies; she, in this sense, keeps the Sabbath, and keeps the feast, but then without reference to any form of worship under the Mosaic Law." (Pp. 218–221.)

Mr Bernard throws into the appendix the substance of what Vitringa, in the chapter above mentioned, says of the Sabbath, in answer to the argument that the words, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy," imply that the Jews were to abstain from all work *in order that they might have more leisure to devote themselves to the worship of God.* "Granting this," he replies, "still it fails to prove the institution of *public worship* on the Sabbath-day. An Israelite, either alone or in his family, could fulfil the *spirit* of the commandment, by passing the day in prayer, in meditation, or in other religious exercises. But further, the *letter*, the primary intention of the commandment has no reference whatever to religious worship. This is abundantly evident from various passages of the Old Testament, and first from the commandment itself: The sacred Lawgiver says, 'Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy;' then follows the way in which it is to be kept holy, 'In it thou shalt do no manner of work,' &c.; and, finally, the reason for the command is assigned, God rested from his work which he had made.* So that the commandment, in fact, amounts to this: Man is to cease from his work on the Sabbath-day, because on that day God rested from his; and by this cessation from work, the day is hallowed. In accordance with this, we find, that whenever the hallowing of the Sabbath-day is commanded in Scripture,† cessation from work is invariably mentioned as the observance of the commandment; 'Ye shall keep the Sabbath, therefore, for it is holy unto you: every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death; *for whosoever doeth any work therein*, that soul shall be cut off from among his people' (Exod. xxxi. 14). And again, to take a passage from one of the Prophets: 'Neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the Sabbath-day: *neither do ye any work*; but hallow ye the Sabbath-day, as I commanded your fathers' (Jer. xvii. 22–24). And that the hallowing of the day should consist in cessation from work, will not appear strange to any one who considers the manner

* If the Commandment in Deut. v. 15 be preferred, the reason which it assigns may be paraphrased thus—"Seeing that the Lord thy God hath delivered thee from grievous slavery in Egypt, it is fit that thou shouldst give to *thy* slaves a weekly day of rest, and shouldst also repose in it thyself, in commemoration of thy deliverance from unceasing toil."

† "And not only the hallowing of the Sabbath, but the hallowing of any other day: thus, when it is said (Exod. xii. 17), 'the first day shall be proclaimed holy,' there is added the way in which it is to be kept holy, '*Ye shall do no servile work therein.*'"

Vitringa observes that the only precept in Exod. xvi. as to Sabbath-keeping is, that no man should go out to gather manna (*i. e.* to *work*. This injunction seems to be the one referred to in the Fourth Commandment, Deut. v. 12, "Keep the Sabbath-day to sanctify it, *as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee.*"

in which the Sabbatical year was hallowed; it was not a separation of the year from other years for religious purposes, for in the context (Lev. xxv. 1, &c.) there is no mention of any religious observances, but a rest of the land from tillage: if, then, a year could be hallowed by a cessation from tillage, why might not a day be hallowed by a cessation from work?

"The Israelite, then, who abstained from all manner of work, kept the commandment *in its letter;* we are far, however, from saying that he would be justified in abusing the rest enjoined, by sins and vicious indulgences, (the Jews were too prone to this, and are severely reproved for it by the Prophet, Isa. lviii. 13, 14). No, he who was a Jew inwardly, and was circumcised in the spirit, would devote this day of rest to the service of his God. Various circumstances invited the Jew to spend the day in prayer and meditation: the sacrifices were increased—a tacit admonition that greater devotion, increased worship, was expected; the day itself was a memorial of the creation, it reminded him of the deliverance from Egypt, it typified the great work of redemption. All these circumstances, connected with the Sabbath, would naturally lead the pious Jew to enjoy the rest commanded, in prayer, and meditation upon the love and mercy of his God; and to feel that this observance, though not enjoined by the letter, was comprehended in its spirit. But still, as the Jew who brought to the priest the accustomed sacrifice, and presented the accustomed offering, fulfilled the law in its letter, though, perhaps, the sacrifice being offered without faith, was not pleasing in the sight of God; so also, with respect to the Sabbath, he fulfilled the commandment who rested from all manner of work; but he fulfilled it in its spirit who did not his own pleasure on this holy day, but called the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord and honourable." (Pp. 241–3.)

It may, however, be doubted whether, among the inducements which invited the Jew to pious exercises on the Sabbath, its typifying the great work of redemption is with good reason here included. Did the Jews in general *know* that it was such a type?

Though holding that the observance of the Sabbath is no longer obligatory, Vitringa thinks that every Christian is bound to observe religiously *the Lord's Day;* "not by *rest*, indeed, which under the New Dispensation has ceased to be a part of the worship of God, but by performing holy exercises acceptable to God." Mr Bernard adds, that "The Christian will no doubt rest from his usual occupations, but it will only be as the means to an end; he will rest, that he may be more actively engaged in the service of God and of his Christ." (P. 244.)

198. Le Clerc, John, *a celebrated Critic and Theologian, Professor of Hebrew in the College of the Dutch Remonstrants at Amsterdam* (*born* 1657; *died* 1736). Mosis Prophetæ Libri Quatuor; Exodus, Leviticus,

Numeri, et Deuteronomium, ex translatione Joannis Clerici, cum ejusdem Paraphrasi perpetua, Commentario philologico, Dissertationibus criticis, et Tabulis chronologicis ac geographicis. Amst. 1696. Fol. Pp. 568.—Le Nouveau Testament de nôtre Seigneur Jesus Christ, traduit sur l'original Grec. Avec des Remarques, où l'on explique le texte, et où l'on rend raison de la version. Par Jean Le Clerc. Amst. 1703. 2 tom. 4to.

As to the Sabbath, see his comments on Exod. xvi. 5, 23; xx. 8–11; Deut. v. 14; Matt. xii. 2, 5, 6, 7, 12; Mark i. 32; ii. 27; iii. 4; Luke xiii. 16; John v. 10, 17; vii. 24; Heb. iv. 3.

He notices that till Exod. xvi. 5, we find neither a precept for the observance of the seventh day, nor any trace that such observance was practised. "And surely," he adds, "a Divine injunction for the observance of a day which was already kept as a festival, would not have been given to the Israelites for the purpose of testing their disposition to submit readily to new commandments." And on verse 23 of the same chapter he remarks, that it would have been unnecessary for Moses to tell the rulers that tomorrow was a Sabbath, &c., if the seventh day had previously been observed. With Spencer and Vitringa, he understands the Fourth Commandment to require only cessation from work, and this "in order to the keeping of the day as a festival in the manner in which festive days were then wont to be celebrated." That such a purpose is implied in the Hebrew notion of keeping a day holy, he deduces "from the Scripture alone, and the other monuments of antiquity." In regard to the ancient mode of spending the day, he mentions that the Israelites used to indulge on it in sports and feasting; as did all other nations, and especially the Egyptians, on *their* festivals. The phrase translated "an holy convocation," he believes to mean a festive meeting designed for the people's enjoyment and relief from the cares of business—"*festum conventum*, hominibus animi oblectandi causâ convenientibus, missis curis, jucundissimum." Of this view he finds confirmation in the law commanding increased offerings on the Sabbath (Numb. xxviii. 3, 4, 9, 10, 24, 25); "for those parts of the sacrificed lambs which fell to the priests were applied to festive purposes:" in illustration of which he quotes Josephus, *Jewish Antiq.*, B. III. cb. 10, § 5; and Philo, *Life of Moses*, B. III., p. 529. Beyond these three things (namely, rest, festive meetings, and increased sacrifices), nothing is anywhere commanded by God as a way of celebrating the Sabbath; "nihil præterea præcipit usquam Deus." Nor, he adds, will the importance of what *was* commanded be undervalued by any one who remembers the sad condition of slaves under inhuman masters, of whom there were doubtless many among the Jews. Unless God himself had taken thought for slaves, no respite from toil

could have been hoped for by this unhappy class; and hence it is, that while we read of most serious conspiracies by slaves against the freemen, occurring frequently in other ancient states, not a single case of the sort is found in the history of the Jews.

But in later times, he proceeds, the Hebrews appear to have spent the seventh day, like other feast-days, in hearing religious discourses; at least they repaired to the prophets, who, it is likely, used to hold such discourses with those who came to them (2 Kings iv 23). After the captivity, the Jews met in synagogues, where the Law and the Prophets were publicly read, as we learn from the books of the New Testament (Mark i. 21; Luke iv. 16; Acts xiii. 14; xv. 21; xvi. 13; xvii. 2; xviii. 4). This custom, he adds, is mentioned also in several places by Philo and Josephus (see above, i. 116, 118), "but, as men of learning have remarked, it is nowhere commanded by Moses. (See, among others, John Spencer, *De Legibus Ritualibus*, lib. i. c. 4, where this whole matter is learnedly and copiously discussed.) And certainly none will deny that those who so spent the Sabbath, *sanctified* it in a more excellent sense than those who merely rested from work; yet no other *sanctification* than this appears to have been intended by God in the Fourth Commandment, where rest for the benefit of slaves is the only thing taken notice of." (P. 91.)

The comments of Le Clerc on several passages in the New Testament are here subjoined:—

Matt. xii. 2: *Began to pluck the ears of corn.* "Apparently the disciples had been long without food, and, having none ready, could not, without much inconvenience, endure the hunger which they felt. They therefore did not scruple to rub the ears in their hands, and eat the corn. In ordinary circumstances, as they knew well, it was unlawful to prepare any food on the Sabbath-day, for which reason it was kept ready from Friday; see Exod. xvi. 23."

Matt. xii. 8: *For the son of man is lord even of the Sabbath-day.* "By comparing this place with Mark ii. 27, we shall be satisfied that Jesus Christ does not here mean himself, but any man whatever of the Jewish nation; no such man being obliged to observe the Sabbath, if too much inconvenience would thereby be occasioned to him."

Mark ii. 27: *The Sabbath was made for the man and not the man for the Sabbath; therefore the son of man is lord even of the Sabbath.**

* Le Clerc's translation is, "Le Sabbat a été fait pour l'homme et non l'homme pour le Sabbat; de sorte que le fils de l'homme est maître du Sabbat même." In French, as in Greek and Latin, the same phrase signifies *man* and *the man*; that Le Clerc uses "l'homme" in the latter sense, is evident from his comment. (See above, i. 57, note †.) From another note in the same page, it will be seen that Dr Campbell and others agree with him in understanding by "the son of man," not Jesus, but *any* man subject to the Sabbath-law. So the words are interpreted by Grotius likewise (above, i. 221). By this class of commentators, the phrase, "lord of the Sabbath," is modernized to "master of the Sabbath;" by which they understand one having dominion over it, to the extent of being entitled to disregard it when abstinence from work would be prejudicial to himself or others.

"That is to say, God instituted the Sabbath for the benefit of the Jews, in order to make them celebrate the memory of the creation, and give relief to their slaves; not to fatigue and damage themselves by the rigorous observance of a ceremony which has nothing excellent in itself and apart from its purpose. Thus, provided they never lost sight of the end for which the Sabbath was instituted by God, there was no need for observing it with that extreme rigour which the Jews here required of the disciples. Even the practice of the Jews was at variance with their censure; as our Lord reproaches them in Matt. xii. 11, 12."

Luke xiii. 16: *Ought not this woman be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath-day?* "It is seen from this and many other discourses of our Lord, that God assumes that men will employ their reason in interpreting his laws, and in applying them to the cases to which they belong. Without this, the rigid observance of the letter would often throw human society into confusion."

John v. 10: *It is not lawful for thee to carry thy bed.* "This was indeed an act prohibited in the ordinary course of life; but the inference did not follow, that one who had performed the miracles which our Lord had just done could not dispense with the observance of the Sabbath in a case like that. It was useful that this man who had been so long diseased, and who, consequently, was known to many, should be seen not only walking, but also burdened with his bed, the very day when he was cured; for on that day, being the Sabbath, the people were at leisure and could observe him without going out of their way, and it was important that they should perceive the suddenness of his cure, which was a proof of its miraculous performance. A case so extraordinary was an ample warrant for the violation of the Sabbath; and if the Jews had not been more attached to the ceremonies than to the essentials of religion, they would very easily have tolerated so slight a violation of the Sabbath for the sake of the miracle."

Acts v. 21: *For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him*, &c. "It is as if James had said that they need not fear that the Law of Moses would be forgotten; as they might have objected to him, when he declared the Gentiles to be free from its observance."

The drift of James's argument in ver. 21 has been very differently understood by expositors; see Baumgarten on the Acts of the Apostles, vol. ii. p. 54, Morrison's Translation. The interpretation preferred by Baumgarten is that of Erasmus, whom Le Clerc also follows in the note just quoted.

199. The New Testament Sabbath; or, Considerations concerning the precise Time of Worship that Christians are obliged to by the Doctrine and Practice of Christ and his Apostles. Lond. 1696. 8vo.

200. GRASCOME, SAMUEL, *a Presbyter of the Church*

of England.—The Scripture History of the Sabbath. Lond. 1700.

It appears from Keach's work (No. 201) that Grascome believed the Sabbath to have been instituted in the time of Moses.

201. KEACH, BENJAMIN, *Pastor of a Baptist congregation in Southwark* (*born* 1640; *died* 1704).—The Jewish Sabbath Abrogated: or, the Saturday-Sabbatarians confuted. In two parts. First, Proving the Abrogation of the Old Seventh-day Sabbath; secondly, that the Lord's-day is of Divine Appointment. Containing several Sermons newly preached upon a special Occasion, wherein are many new Arguments not found in former Authors. Lond. 1700. 8vo. Pp. 279.

Keach was a man of considerable note among his brethren, and though in a great measure self-taught, he was a poet and an expositor, as well as a controversialist. In the last of these characters he makes a good appearance in the work before us, to the composition of which he was led in the manner thus related in his preface: "I was alarmed on a sudden, and provoked (some few months ago) to undertake it; there being one person especially under my charge (who for some time, by his unsettled and wavering spirit, and aspiring temper, I feared would be troublesome) who had for some considerable time, unknown to me, sucked in the notion of the Jewish Sabbath, and laboured to corrupt many others of the younger sort, some of which, with himself, fell into the practice of keeping that day, and cast off the Lord's-day, as not being of Divine appointment. Some of them being apprentices, declared they would and could do any business or work for their masters upon the first day of the week: and this principle they received without acquainting me or the Church with it, or ever coming to me to hear what I had to say against it; insomuch that when it was publicly known it had almost put the whole Congregation into a flame; but to prevent which, I was desired by divers members to endeavour to convince them by scripture and solid arguments, which I laboured to do, but found all was in vain as to several of them. So that the brethren saw it was necessary for me to preach upon this subject, which I myself perceived an absolute necessity to do; and praised be the Lord who hath blessed my undertaking herein, and answered my hopes, which was not so much to regain those hot-headed and conceited young men, as to establish, confirm, and strengthen all others; many being much startled, and doubting which day they ought to observe, which the ringleaders I perceived much gloried at, some of them giving it out, that they hoped to bring over great part of the congregation to their opinion."

He argues against the doctrine of a Creation Sabbath, on which

the Seventh-day Baptists build so much; maintains that "the law of the Decalogue was given to no people but the people of Israel;" and, like Baxter (No. 160), conceives the Lord's-day to be a divinely appointed but independent institution of the Christian Church. On the narrative in Exod. xvi., he comments as follows:

"Observe, by the way, that here is not one word on what day the manna first fell, so that none can tell this was the seventh day from the creation; but that it was the seventh day after the six days of its raining of manna, is evident.

"But to return to our business in hand; here, I say, is the original, or first beginning of the Sabbath, that we read of, as to any precept or injunction on the people, or any observation of it; which was, as one observes, about a month before Moses received the Law on Mount Sinai.

"Some, it is true, would infer that the Sabbath was known and observed by the Jews before, because (they say) it is here spoken of as a thing well known.

"1. I answer in the words of a late author: 'This is a force put upon the words, and a gross mistake; for it is evidently spoken of as a new thing, else what means that frequent inculcation to make the people take notice of it, if it had been familiar to them before? And what means the coming of the rulers of the congregation to Moses to consult him as on an unusual and unknown matter?' (Grascome's *History of the Sabbath*, p. 76.)

"2. And let me add, they were told that they should gather it six days, and that there should be none found on the seventh; and yet some of the people went to gather it on the seventh day, as not being yet well acquainted with their Sabbath, ver. 26, 27, and this displeased the Lord; and therefore Moses again told them, ver. 29, 'See, for the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day bread for two days.'

"'He hath given you the Sabbath'; doth not this imply he had not given it to any before? To you, and none else; to you and to none that went before you, as he spake to them afterwards, Deut. v. 2, 3. As to his laws and covenant on Mount Sinai, 'the covenant which God made with us in Horeb, the Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us who are alive this day.' . . .

"*Object.* I know that Dr Owen saith, 'If the original of the Sabbath was here, then the national observation of it is introduced with a strange abruptness,' &c. (Dr Owen *on the Sabbath*, p. 62.)

"*Ans.* To which I answer, that it doth not so appear to me; however, let every man read the words of Moses again, and how he repeats the same over and over, 'to morrow is the Sabbath,' &c., 'To-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord;' again, 'the Lord hath given you the Sabbath;' can anything be brought in more solemnly? But I see how men will try their wits to defend their own Scriptureless notion of a Sabbath given in paradise, as well as in pleading for other groundless practices." (Pp. 76–79.)

In reply to the argument for the Seventh-day Sabbath, drawn

from Matt. xxiv. 20, he says: "This text some learned men have not, I am satisfied, given the right sense of. But let us premise three things:—

"1. That Christ gave the old names to Jewish ordinances very often, and so did his Apostles.

"2. That our Lord well knew how superstitiously zealous the unbelieving Jews were and would remain for their Sabbath.

"Now pray mind the scope of this text: Christ shows how sudden their flight would be when Jerusalem was to be destroyed, ver. 16, 17.; and ver. 19, he saith, 'Woe to them that are with child, and them that give suck in those days. But pray that your flight be not in the winter, nor on the Sabbath-day; for then shall be great tribulation.'

"3. It is evident there is the same reason they should pray that their flight be not in the winter, as not on the Jewish Sabbath-day.

"Why not in the winter? Because of the difficulties of the ways; they might be deep and unpassable then, whereby their escape might be hindered.

"Why not on the Sabbath-day? Because, say some, their consciences would not admit them to fly then further than a Sabbath-day's journey. It is strange to me that our Lord should tell them a little before, that it was lawful to save the life of a sorry animal,—a brute,—on the Sabbath-day, and bid a man take up his bed or bear a burden on the Sabbath; and now hint that it was not lawful, or that they would so think, to save their lives by flying on the Sabbath-day. Believe this who will. Was it not lawful to pull an ox or sheep out of a pit on the Sabbath-day; or for men to carry their goods out of their houses on the Sabbath-day, if a fire should then happen? I do not think they were ever so superstitiously blind.

"Nay, to preserve human life our Lord shewed was much more lawful on that day than the life of beasts.

"But, say some, it would be grievous and uncomfortable to them to fly on that day in which they used to find so much delight.

"*Ans.* Our Lord gives a direct contrary reason, *i.e.* 'for then will be great tribulation;' the unbelieving Jews, should they fly on their Sabbath, would severely handle them, may be knock them on the head; on this account our Lord bids them so to pray; therefore this could not be the meaning of it.

"Moreover, he knew his own disiples before that time came, would be convinced that the Jewish Sabbath was ceased with other legal rites.

"Therefore this I take to be the direct meaning of our blessed Lord, viz., because on the Jewish Sabbath-day, the unbelieving Jews, among whom you will remain (or many of you), when the destruction of the city comes, may be so strict and superstitious as to keep watch and ward at every gate and way, that you will not be able to escape, at least not above one of their Sabbath-day's journey; therefore pray your flight be not on that day. This is all I can see in this text." (Pp. 148–9.)

It is a text appealed to not only by the Seventh-day Baptists, but by those numerous advocates of the Puritan Sabbath who are ignorant that, in the early ages of the Church, "*the Sabbath-day*" was a phrase never used to express anything but the seventh day of the week. (See above, i. 125, 170, 196–7, 257; ii. 5, 12, 55.) But this text is *not* among the proofs of "the Christian Sabbath" quoted in the Westminster Catechism (see above, i. 233); and it is eagerly repudiated, as such, by Hengstenberg, who speaks, in connection with it, of "the mass of untenable arguments which are put in circulation in support of the strict Sabbatarian view of the Sunday." (*The Lord's Day*, p. 106.) Mr Holden (*The Christian Sabbath*, p. 215, quoted by Cox, p. 506) is on the same side; as is also Mr Oliver, in his *Prize Essay*, p. 49.

In treating of "the Gospel Sabbath, or the Lord's Day," Mr Keach argues at some length that the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 1) was the first day of the week, and that then the first day was confirmed to be the day of Gospel worship, which, as he thinks, "our Lord Christ had certainly given directions to his disciples to observe." (P. 175.) Of this belief "a clear confirmation" is found by him in Heb. iv. 8, &c. (P. 199.) And he adduces Acts xx. 7, 1 Cor. xvi. 2, and Rev. i. 10, as "proving the first day of the week to be the special day of solemn worship under the Gospel." (Pp. 224–252.) Lastly: "those fearful judgments inflicted by God on such as have profaned the Lord's Day, shew that it is of Divine institution;" for, "Can any think that Jehovah would punish any person for neglecting or violating an human tradition, or an ordinance of man?" (P. 258).

202. LIMBORCH, PHILIP, *Professor of Theology in the College of the Remonstrants at Amsterdam* (*born* 1633; *died* 1712).—Theologia Christiana ad Praxin Pietatis ac Promotionem Pacis Christianæ unice directa. Editio Tertia, ab autore recognita et aucta. Amst. 1700. Fol. Pp. 874.

Limborch was a friend of Locke, whom he resembled in moderation, piety, ability, and candour. So early as 1661 he wrote a treatise in favour of toleration, from which Locke probably derived some aid in writing his famous *Letters* on the same subject. Of Limborch's *Christian Theology* the first edition was published in 1686. There is an English translation of it, entitled, "A Complete System or Body of Divinity, both speculative and practical, founded on Scripture and Reason; translated, with improvements from Wilkins, Tillotson, Scott, and others, by William Jones, Presbyter." Lond. 1702; 2 vols. 8vo.

In Book V. chap. 28, "On the Place and Time of Worship, and particularly the Lord's Day," he treats briefly but comprehensively of the Sabbath, presenting the chief arguments for and against the opinion that it is a Christian institution. His own judgment is

adverse to that view. He rejects the alleged primeval Sabbath; regards the Fourth Commandment as a positive, not a moral, law; and recognises in the observance of the Lord's Day a custom freely begun by the early Christians for their convenience in holding religious assemblies. "If," says he, "the time of meeting for worship was not left to their own choice, surely God would somewhere in the New Testament have determined it. But this he has nowhere done. The first day of the week is, however, observed among the Christians; and that this was the case so early as the Apostolic times, is rightly concluded from John xx. 26, Acts xx. 7, 1 Cor. xvi. 2, and Rev. i. 10. Yet the observance was not from the obligation of a Divine command, but from free choice, influenced nevertheless by this fit reason, that on the first day of the week our Lord had risen from the dead." (§ 13.) The selection of a certain day having been made, and ever since adhered to, Limborch conceives that no Christian is now at liberty to introduce an arbitrary and groundless change, in opposition to the great body of the Christian Church.

The sanctification of the Lord's Day he regards as consisting, not in bodily rest, but in religious exercises, for the performance of which it is needful that both labour and recreation be suspended—works of necessity and mercy being always, however, attended to. He shows that Matt. xxiv. 20 refers to the Seventh-day Sabbath; and concludes by remarking, that the true Sabbath to be observed by Christians now, and of which the ancient Sabbath was a type, is *rest from sin*, and, as its consequence, our entrance into God's eternal rest. This, he thinks, is the Sabbath alluded to by Isaiah (lvi. 2; lviii. 13, 14), and eminently spoken of in the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

203. SCHWARTZ, *General Superintendent of Holstein.*—A True Account of the Sabbath; in reply to Burman's false doctrine, which a minister in Holstein has sanctioned, and introduced into Germany, with evil consequences to the Land. 1701.

The German translator of Burman's work on the Sabbath (No. 149) was Lünekogel; by whom were added to it a preface and notes, defending its author's opinion that the law of the Sabbath was purely ceremonial, and does not apply to Christians. The translation was published in 1700. (Hengstenberg, p. 71.)

204. MORER, THOMAS, *Rector of the United Parishes of SS. Ann and Agnes, within Aldersgate, and St John Zachary, London.*—ΚΥΡΙΑΚΗ' 'ΗΜΕΡΑ. A Discourse in Six Dialogues on the Name, Notion, and Observation of the Lord's Day. With an Account of several Canons, Decrees, and Laws, foreign and English,

for the keeping it holy. The Way of Worship in the Church of England vindicated. And, An Office, or Collection of Devotions, proper for the Day. Lond. 1701. 8vo. Pp. 584.

This is a solid, temperate, and learned defence of the High Church opinions maintained by White, Sanderson, Taylor, and others, respecting the Sabbath. The author argues thus against the belief that the Lord's Day was an institution of Christ, and bore its title from the very date of his resurrection :—

" Had there been any such institution of our Lord, or that the Apostles made it a custom to call this day by that name, I wonder to find St Paul passing it by, who everywhere in his writings styles it ' the first day of the week' whenever he had occasion to speak of the day as a day of meeting and Divine worship. It is not to be conceived that this zealous man who always consulted his Master's honour, should be profoundly silent in a thing which so much concerned him; and that he who writ so many Epistles to the Gentiles, and treated of so many points respecting Christianity, should never once mention the Lord's Day in all those places, wherein though he takes notice of the day, yet he sets it down under another name, and doth it when there was no shadow of reason for conforming himself to that language, because his letters were directed to the Greek, Roman, and Asiatic converts, to whom ' the Lord's Day,' had been more proper and welcome than ' the first day of the week,' which was too judaizing in a person who after his conversion appeared so great a stickler against Judaism. Thus in one of his Epistles, he gives these directions to them at Corinth : ' On the first day of the week let every one of you lay by in store as God hath prospered him.' (1 Cor. xvi. 2.) This was writ to a Church remote enough from the Jews, and as is supposed about the year 57, yet no hint of the Lord's-day but under the old name. And in the Itinerary of the Apostles which St Luke penned some years after, the same form of words is used as it was commonly known to the Churches : ' And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them.' (Acts xx. 7.) The apostle was at Troas an whole week, as we find by the context, ' We came to Troas in five days, where we abode seven days,' one only of which was solemnly kept, and it is called ' the first day of the week ;' so that either the Lord's-day was not observed at all within this time, or, not being known by that name it was observed in the periphrasis of ' the first day of the week.' " (Pp. 45–46.)

A moderate objector is introduced, representing that the apostle " had indeed fair opportunities to mention it; yet his not doing so concludes little. Herein he complied with the way of the other Evangelists who writ before him, and who call it ' the first day of the week,' according to the supputation of the country which was the scene of our Lord's actions."

To which it is answered: "This concurrence of all the sacred writers confirms the doubt. But that I confess which stumbles me most is the authority of St Paul, who appears so zealous against the Jewish Sabbath, calls it a mere shadow, denies the obligation of it in the Christian Church, and yet so far revives and so much honours it as still to call the week by its name, and the first day (*μίαν τῶν σαββάτων*) 'one' or 'the first of the Sabbath,' when he was speaking religiously of that day, and had a better and fitter name for it, if indeed the name was in use at that time." (P. 55.)

Further on, the objector says: "As far as I can gather from your discourse hitherto, you incline to the opinion of the Rhemists, to make the observation of this day a tradition and custom of the Church, grounded more on the reasonableness of the practice, than any Divine authority proposing and requiring it. And of this mind was Tindal, who looked on it with so indifferent an eye, that he declared in his answer to Sir Thomas More, that 'we are lords of the Sabbath, and may change it to Monday or any other day, or appoint every tenth day, or two days in a week, as we find it most expedient.' And so Barclay saith of Calvin, that he once designed to translate it to Thursday, as an instance of Christian liberty, especially being the day whereon might be commemorated the most triumphant and glorious act of our Lord, his ascension up into heaven. But if you go this way to work, and allow the Decalogue to contain ceremonial laws, as well as moral, you give a fair opportunity to the Papist to interpret the Second Commandment as you do the Fourth, and so may dismiss it as a temporal law prohibiting images as dangerous things to the Jews, but [which] are innocent and useful in these latter days for the better information and instruction of the ignorant.

"*Ans.* The doctrine of images is exploded by the law of Nature, and the better reason of mankind, which looks on it as a thing very absurd and inconsistent with the notion of an Infinite Spirit, an Almighty, Eternal, Immortal, Invisible, and Wise God, to be represented in that gross manner, and what might make a sober man laugh to see the carpenter, smith, or painter adoring the works of his own hands. . . . As for the opinion of Calvin and Tindal about changing the day, I answer it is a distinction of Suarez, that the alteration of the Lord's Day is *absolutely* necessary, but not *practically*; he means that it is needful such a power should be in the Church, though not convenient to put it in execution. Upon this foundation Calvin and Tindal built; and the Sabbatarian tenet breaking out in a fierce manner at the Reformation, was the reason they spake so highly of their Christian liberty in this particular, to put a check to that doctrine. Yet in prudence and discretion the alteration was not made, though as to principle they thought it not amiss to make the adversary sensible of the authority of the Church in a thing which they considered of an indifferent nature. Not that it was a set day which the law of Nature requires for the service of religion, but as one was pitched on rather than another, and they would have that day changeable to prevent

all superstition." (Pp. 216–218.) It is next argued that the doctrine of the Church of England in her Liturgy and Homilies is no other than this.

Again, the objector observes: "Were the Lord's-day, as you hold, an human institution, what an ill influence might this doctrine have on the minds of men, who will be ready to think that they may make bold with a thing which has not the authority of Divine appointment to settle it, and so be induced to further profaneness, except in such notorious instances of irreligion, where the law terrifies them, and yet in the punishing of which the magistrate is almost as remiss as themselves. Whereas, on the other side, where the contrary principle prevails, it not only brings men to church to worship God, but also obligeth them in conscience to do something extraordinary in their families on the Lord's-day towards the educating them in the nurture and fear of the Lord, beyond what they think themselves bound to do on the week days; so that if this were an error, it would be an happy error, as being the occasion of bringing men to the worship of God, and knowledge of the truth. And truly, if I were persuaded that the other opinion (that the sanctification of the Lord's-day hath no other ground than ecclesiastical constitution) were a truth, I should think it a truth not necessary to be published.

"*Ans.* The question is not, what is fit to be preached? but what is truth?—which is able enough to defend itself; and St Chrysostom pronounces that man a betrayer of it, who takes refuge in indirect means to uphold it. And if people will be scandalized at the truth because it is not just such as they would have it, it is much better to let the scandal continue, than to let truth be modelled to their humour. It is the apostle's rule that we should 'not do evil that good may ensue.' Nor can it be prudent and safe to make that a Divine doctrine which is not so, for fear it becomes a reason to call in question those which really are. That the Lord's-day ought to be seriously and solemnly kept, is agreed on all hands; but if men will use such arguments for the observation of it as cannot abide the trial, in this case, instead of enforcing it, they do but tempt profane persons to neglect it the more, who will be apt to judge the day itself to be as weakly grounded, as their reasons are weak, which they offer to maintain it by, and procure it a greater veneration. We cannot, therefore, admit the Lord's-day to be an institution of Christ or his apostles, because the proofs to make it so are very insufficient, and give occasion of scandal. Yet though it will not bear that character, a character so strictly Divine as many would have it, yet we are not destitute of very solid reasons to recommend it, such as are not so liable to exceptions, but if well examined may be very forcible to engage us to keep it. For we say it is a law of Nature to set apart some particular times for the worship of God; and it is a law of the Church and State that Sunday should be the set time to do Him service in; and therefore on this account it obliges the conscience, and a man certainly sins in transgressing it. It was resolved before, that no law in the two

tables obliges a Christian, as a law of Moses, but as a law of Nature, which binds all mankind of what nation or name soever. And such I take the Lord's-day to be, a certain time which Nature has fixed for Divine worship, and which the Church has determined to the seventh, and to the first of the seven, or the first day of the week. I say, the Church (which the Gospel enjoins us to hear), from the beginning of Christianity to this present time, has made this comment on Nature, and our civil governors press it, whom we are commanded to obey not only for wrath but conscience' sake. So that though it is not expressly said, Keep Sunday (or the Lord's day, or the first day of the week) holy, yet seeing Nature proposes some set time, and the Church of God requires such a set time for our service, is not this the same thing as if God himself had said these words from Mount Sion which he said by Moses from Mount Sinai, 'Remember to keep holy,' &c.?" (Pp. 238–240.)

The subject of recreations on the Lord's-day is introduced by the expression of a wish on the objector's part, that Sundays were spent in no worse manner than the author desires. "But alas," he exclaims, "we find it otherwise; and as there is a general neglect in doing the duty of the day among most people who yet bear a Christian name, so I think, in particular, none more faulty in this respect than those of the church communion, and great abetters of the Liturgy. Not that charity will allow me to believe them naturally more irreligious than others; but this indifferency is much owing to the doctrines of your churchmen, who not only tolerate but vigorously defend almost all sorts of recreations, and thereby draw the minds of men from that veneration which is due and ought to be given it. And truly the notion of holiday now is, that it is a day of idleness and vanity; a day set apart either for a literal rest and doing nothing, or doing what ought not to be done, and which people have not leisure to do on any other. Great pains some bishops and other doctors have taken to justify a practice, which, by all their industry and learning, they should have put a check to. But that which did the most mischief was the Declaration of Charles the First. Wherein he commands all the judges in their several circuits to see that 'no man trouble or molest any of his loyal subjects and dutiful people in or for their lawfull recreations, having first done their duty to God, and continuing in obedience to him and his laws'; and further, that 'publication thereof be made by order from the bishops through all the parishes of their several dioceses respectively'——— You find what followed. And God only knows how it is to be understood, and whether it was not one sign of the Divine displeasure to let the people be permitted to take so much liberty against that excellent prince for giving them leave to do as they did on that solemn day assigned to his worship. . . . . Without doubt the design of the Fourth Commandment in forbidding all sorts of common work, was that thereby the people might have leisure and opportunity to do the work of the Sabbath, that is, to meditate on good things and mind the business of reli-

gion. Whatever therefore hinders this design is under the notion of work, although we give it another name. And as for recreations which those apologists seem so much for, they appear to me greater violations of the Divine law than that which is named and forbidden, because work in itself is not only necessary for our present being, but some kind of honour redounds to God by it in case we consider and declare ourselves the instruments of his providence in what we do for the support of ourselves and families. Whereas these sports do not only alienate the mind from those heavenly thoughts they should on this day be employed in, but they often prove sinful in the very act, and the end is dismal.

"*Ans.* The doctrine of our Church is as sound for observing the Lord's-day as you would have it. And as the laws of our nation punish offenders of this kind, so the ecclesiastical decrees and constitutions ordain and teach that it ought to be solemnly kept by all her children, as you have heard at large before. And as for particular doctors, though of venerable authority, yet their writings are no further accounted the doctrines of the Church than as they agree with those Canons and Homilies mentioned above. However, as to those gentlemen you point at, the end they proposed in what they said on this subject was to encounter Judaism; not by any means to encourage profaneness, but to stop superstition. The main thing they drove at was, to disprove the morality of the Fourth Commandment with respect to that form of words in which it is there set down, and to shew that though by the laws of God and nature a set time was to be sequestered for the Divine worship, yet the determination of that time, and the modes of that worship, was left to the Church and the wisdom of those under whose government we live. This, I say, was what they chiefly intended; and then the consequence which they proceeded to was, that recreations on that day were no sin, provided they were not instances of disobedience to our superiors, either with reference to themselves, as lawful, or those hours allotted for them. Some diversions are indeed immoral and vicious, and these ought not to be used on any day, much less on Sunday. Others have not naturally this contagion, yet may be unlawful, either because the magistrate forbids them, or forbids them to be used at this or that time; and even these are sinful, because we disobey our governors who require us to forbear them. But there are a third sort innocent in themselves, as walking in the fields or discoursing with men of liberal education, and legally inoffensive, as refreshing the body and leaving little impression on the mind; and such King James I. declares dancing, archery, leaping, vaulting and the like to be, and which those authors you mean allow youth, so far forth as they make them 'fitter for God's service the rest of the day, and for the works of their vocation the rest of the week.' As for King Charles I., it appears plainly by the laws he made for keeping the Lord's-day, that he had a very pious inclination to have it reverenced by all his people. But some over-righteous and nice ministers both in the church and state, mistaking the meaning of

those laws, and putting a greater restraint on people than was intended at first, he sets out that Declaration you speak of, for the ease of the subject, to let him enjoy himself as far as religion and the statutes of the kingdom permitted. . . . . So that you see in this the reasons those princes and divines had to excuse recreations on Sunday in the last age. It was to give a check to the errors of some preachers and others then in being, whose doctrines had succeeded better had not this toleration stopt them. In disputes and controversies it is an easy thing to strain a little too far, in opposing an extreme coming violently on us; yet the supposition being true, that the natural justice of the Divine law and the positive precepts of governors, commanding no longer space of time for actual performance of religious offices upon the Lord's-day than such as is both necessary for God's solemn worship and for the spiritual edification of Christian people, when that time is expired and the service over, if men, for the refreshment of their spirits, betake themselves to those exercises as the law either expressly or silently allows, those writers cannot be so much blamed to let us both see and enjoy our liberty (especially as their case then was with respect to the obligation of the Fourth Commandment and Sabbatarian doctrine); and if they produced many authorities, ancient and modern, to confirm the practice, it was not with design to introduce one error by baffling another, but to state rightly and make good the question then on foot, and to demonstrate that the law of the two tables was sufficiently observed, as long as nothing was done to injure it in its equity. However, the case is now altered; and as the constitutions of this Church and the laws of the nation are very strict for the honour of God (and if not executed by those to whose care they are intrusted, they must not bear the blame); so neither press nor pulpit afford us any thing but what corresponds with them." (Pp. 548–553.)

The volume contains many accurate historical details respecting the progress of opinion, legislation, and controversy, about the Sabbath and the Lord's-day.

205. WOODWARD, JOSIAH, D.D., *Minister of Poplar, and afterwards of Maidstone.*—An Earnest Persuasive to the Serious Observance of the Lord's Day. Lond. 1703. 8vo.

206. JURIEU, PETER, *a French Protestant Divine*; (*born* 1637; *died* 1713).—Histoire Critique des Dogmes et des Cultes, bons et mauvais, qui ont été dans l'Eglise depuis Adam jusqu'à Jésus Christ: où l'on trouve l'origine de toutes les Idolatries de l'ancien Paganisme expliquées par rapport à celles des Juifs. Amst. 1704. 4to. Pp. 809.

The following references in the index, article SABBAT, will show sufficiently the author's opinions, and how he treats the subject. "The Sabbath-day was not sanctified before Moses, 40. Whether its observance is of all times? 104. Reasons of those who maintain its antiquity, 105. The Sabbath known and reverenced by all the Gentile nations, 105, 106, 116. The Romans looked upon it as an unlucky day, 107, 117. Reasons of those who deny its antiquity, 107. The law of the Sabbath was not given to Adam, 108. God gave the Sabbath to the Israelites for reasons which were good only in regard to them, 108, 109. Authorities and evidence against the antiquity of the Sabbath, 109, 113. The first Sabbath was celebrated in the wilderness, 110. Whether the Sabbath-day is the seventh day from the creation of the world, 110, 111. Examination of the words of Moses cited for the antiquity of the Sabbath, 118, 119. What was the covert of the Sabbath, spoken of in the book of Kings, 210. How the people were warned on the eve of the Sabbath to cease from work, 294. Of the service of the Sabbath, 324. Of the origin of the Sabbath, 352. Rules of its observance, 353. The Jews might defend themselves on it, 353. What was a Sabbath-day's journey, 353. Of the assemblies which were held on that day, 353. The Sabbath of years, 354. The great Sabbath of years, 358, *et seq.*"

An English translation of the book was published at London in 1705; 2 vols. 8vo.

207. PLACETTE, JOHN LA, *a French Protestant Divine, Pastor of a French Church at Copenhagen* (*born* 1639; *died* 1718.)—Dissertations sur divers Sujets de Morale et de Theologie. Amst. 1704. 12mo. Pp. 376.

Of these dissertations the third and last is "Sur le Quatrième Commandement, et sur la manière en laquelle les Chrétiens doivent l'observer." (Pp. 285–376.)

In chapter 1. the writer inquires whether the Fourth Commandment enjoins *six days' work* as well as *the seventh day's rest*. He inclines to the affirmative answer; work being regarded as an imitation of God's creative labours, and hence religious in its character. But the question seems to him unimportant, since the duty of work has ample support otherwise, from Scripture and reason. Chapter 2. considers what it was that God required from the Israelites when he ordered them to sanctify the seventh day: As, in working six days, they were not bound to deny themselves sleep, nourishment, and necessary relaxation, so, he thinks, God did not mean the seventh day to be spent, without intermission, in pious exercises. The Sabbath-law, he maintains, related to Saturday, and not to any other day of the week. In chapter 3. he states the opinion, that the Israelites were required to sanctify

the seventh day by setting it apart as a day for certain religious services: 1. Those of the tabernacle and temple (Numb. xxviii. 9, 10); and, 2. Those of other places, viz., extraordinarily careful abstinence from sin, and the performance of acts of piety and holiness (Isa. i. 13, 14, 15; lvi. 1, 2; lviii. 13, 14), particularly assembling for public worship (Lev. xxiii. 3); while private devotions, which ought not to be neglected on any day, were doubly a duty on the Sabbath. Chapter 5. inquires whether Christians ought to observe all that the Fourth Commandment imposed on the Jews? Chap. 6. points out the positive regulations contained in that precept, and which are not obligatory on Christians. Chap. 7. maintains that the commandment has in it also something moral and perpetual; and the 8th considers how much time the law of Nature obliges us to employ in the service of God. Chap. 9. inquires by what authority we observe the Sunday. Chap. 10. replies to the question, Could the Church now alter the institution of the Sunday? whereon the decision is, that were the whole Church to agree for good reasons to change the day, this might lawfully be done; but that neither is such agreement possible, nor are any such reasons conceivable. Chapters 11. and 12. relate to the public and private exercises by means of which the day of rest is to be sanctified; and Chapter 13. to things forbidden to be done—which are, such as hinder the public, domestic, or private service of God, or, though not in themselves sinful, offend the weaker brethren. As for pastimes, he holds that these being seldom innocent, or unattended by evil consequences, they are incompatible with the nature of the Lord's Day. He especially disapproves of feasts. In the 14th chapter, which concludes the Dissertation, he explains why nothing is said about the origin of the Sabbath. "The reason is, not that I doubt that the Sabbath was as ancient as the world, but solely that I do not think it follows necessarily from this that we ought to observe it under the Gospel." (P. 373.) If this conclusion *did* follow, the day to be observed by us would, he thinks, be the seventh day of the week, which God blessed and sanctified at the creation of the world.

208. HOWELL, JOHN, "*a Presbyter of the Church of England.*"—A Practical Discourse on the Lord's Day; with Devotions proper for the Day. Lond. 1704. 8vo. Pp. 280.

The Puritan opinions are inculcated with considerable ability by Mr Howell, who, however, regards cessation from work and recreation as incumbent only in respect of their being impediments to works of piety and charity. He conceives that "the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian Church are one and the same Church, or spiritual society"; which Church "hath been all along governed by the same laws and religion in the main." (Pp. 56–76.) He strenuously maintains, also, the universal and permanent

obligation of the Decalogue; and gets rid of the objection that the Fourth Commandment enjoins the observance of Saturday as the Sabbath, by arguing that only a seventh day's rest after six days' labour is there spoken of: "what day of the week from the creation either the Jewish or Christian Sabbath is, the sacred volumes have not told us; nor have we any other means of discovery. Neither, indeed, is it necessary, nor perhaps convenient, that we should know it: not necessary, because we may commemorate the creation as gratefully and worthily altogether on any one of the six days in course from it as on the seventh; not convenient, lest the knowledge thereof should minister occasion of dispute and division, as we find by experience the bare conjecture, how groundless soever, hath in some measure done." (P. 17.)

"Observe, it is not said, remember the seventh day from the creation; or the seventh from thy deliverance out of Egypt, or from the first fall of manna; but remember the Sabbath-day, a term or title, that, on the supposition of a Divine appointment, will equally fit any day of holy rest, whether first, second, &c., of the Jewish week. It must indeed, as the next words tell us, be a seventh day, but a seventh after six days of labour, which, according as those working-days are variously computed, may and must vary, yet without any alteration in the substance of the Commandment." (Pp. 95, 96.) . . . . . "Then after an enumeration of the persons concerned in this prohibition, and a provision for the ease of labouring men, and cattle, there follows the reason why a seventh-day Sabbath is enjoined; 'For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, &c., and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it.' Which may be thus paraphrased: As the Lord in the formation of the world worked six days, and resting on the seventh blessed and sanctified it, Gen. ii. 2, 3, so he still reserves to himself the old proportion of man's time on the old reason, a seventh day for holy rest after six of labour, in memory and imitation of his blessing and sanctifying the day of thy rest, as he formerly did the day of his own. This I take to be the true meaning and purport of the commandment: and if I am not much mistaken, it will be hard to find any tittle in it peculiar to the Jewish Sabbath, or not fairly applicable to the Christian." (Pp. 96, 97.)

He thus appears to discountenance the opinion that the week is a memorial of the creation; for surely, if used from the beginning, it would have preserved the knowledge which the Westminster Assembly assume to exist, in teaching that "from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, God appointed the seventh day of the week to be the weekly Sabbath." (See above, i. 233.)

In contending for the universal obligation of the Decalogue, he entirely overlooks the question, Whether the teaching of Christ and his apostles, to Jews living under the Mosaic law, be as fully applicable to Gentile Christians as to those of the Jewish race? Moreover, he finds it necessary to maintain that "the Jews were

confederated with God in *two several covenants*, which, though they were not inconsistent, yet were very different one from the other. For beside that evangelical covenant [of the Decalogue] which belonged to them as a Church, or spiritual society, they had, as a Commonwealth, or civil state, a covenant of a political nature, and that peculiar to them, and their proselytes of righteousness, who made one body politic with them." (P. 77.)

It is difficult to imagine that either this plan of splitting into two "*the covenant*" which we read of in the books of Moses, or even the notion that the Jews played the two distinct parts of God's *Church* and his chosen *People* or race, could have gained a footing among divines, if, instead of ascribing to the word ἐκκλησία (*ecclesia*), in the Septuagint, the modern theological sense of the word *Church*, they had inquired more carefully what it was used to signify by the ancient writers. For the meaning of *ecclesia* is in fact nothing more abstruse than *an assembly*. It "answers to the Hebrew word *kahal*, which denotes an assembly legally convened. Thus the Jewish people, when assembled as a body politic to receive the law, are called *kahal* (Deut. ix. 10); and St Stephen, referring to this assembly, styles it *ecclesia* (Acts viii. 38): nay more, the turbulent crowd in the temple of Diana at Ephesus is also called *ecclesia* (Acts xix. 32), because it was a legal assembly." (*The Synagogue and the Church*, condensed from Vitringa by Joshua L. Bernard, p. 1.)*

Howell says that "some of the ancient Fathers distinguish the Lord's-day from the Jewish day of rest, by calling it 'the Christian Sabbath,' 'our Sabbath,' or the like." (P. 99.) But instead of *quoting* any evidence of this from the Fathers, he merely gives two *references*, the first of which is to Origen's 23d Homily on Numbers, containing a passage (quoted above, i. 196) which is so far from warranting his assertion, that its tendency is precisely the reverse. His other reference is to a discourse on the resurrection of Christ by Gregory of Nyssa, which I have not seen, but from which Cocceius, in his *Indagatio Naturæ Sabbati, &c.*, p. 202, quotes a few sentences that have a like hostile tendency, as far as they go; and, in a passage cited by Mr Holden from Gregory's 7th Homily on Ecclesiastes, this Father, following the usual course of the early Christian writers, represents the Christian Sabbath to be *a rest from sin*: "The law," says he, "commands us to keep a Sabbath, or a rest from sinful works: for the scope of the two tables of the Levitical ordinances, and of the laws in Deuteronomy, is, that we may cease from those works, the doing of which is sinful."

* "In the New Testament," it is added, "the word *ecclesia* is used in an extended, and also in a limited sense; it signifies the whole Christian community, the entire body of believers,—governed by one spirit, united by one faith, with one supreme head, Jesus Christ, in heaven; it is also applied to the Christian community in one city, or even to the congregation accustomed to assemble in one house (Philemon; 1 Cor. xvi. 19): but still, in every case, a legal bond of union enters into the idea of the word." (Bernard, p. 2.)

(Holden's *Christian Sabbath*, p. 315.) It seems likely, then, that the proof from Gregory is as bad as that from Origen; though, were it otherwise, we should find nothing important in the fact that a writer, in whose time the Lord's Day was kept (in obedience to the edict of Constantine) as a day of rest from labour, had called it what it then was—"our Sabbath," or "the Christian Sabbath."

With respect to recreation he says: "It is certain, that to eat and drink on our Lord's Day for the recreating or refreshing of the body and mind, and that in a more splendid manner than men ordinarily do on other days, is very agreeable to the design and nature of a festival as well as to the allowed* practice of the Jews on their Sabbath. But forasmuch as the festival is a religious one, all due regard is to be had to its religious duties; 'and whether we eat or drink, or whatever we do,' we are then more especially to intend 'the glory of God,' 1 Cor. x. 31. And to make it a day of gluttony, drunkenness, and other kinds of sensuality; or spend more of that sacred time in pampering of the body, and fulfilling the lusts of the flesh, than is really consistent with the due care of the soul; is to make it a heathenish rather than Christian feast, and that too of the worser, the looser sort.

"Again, as we cannot but allow of such meals or provisions as are proper for our religious festival, so it is but fit and congruous that some competent time be allowed for digesting them; and as far as any innocent inoffensive discourse, or exercise, whether diverting or not diverting, may be needful or requisite for health and digestion, so far do they seem to be allowable and proper for the festival.

"Besides, a moderate refreshment of the body, and relaxation of the mind, may be sometimes requisite in order to devotion itself, which, if long continued, is, without such helps, apt to flag, expire, and die. For the mind of man in its present state of union with the body, doth and must act by the animal spirits as its instruments; and unless these be supplied, or excited, as occasion requires, it cannot be long intent upon any subject, and must therefore, when tired out with the exercises of devotion, have some convenient and becoming relaxation or refreshment, whereby it may be enabled to return to them with fresh vigour and alacrity.

"So that supposing and allowing for the good intention of some persons, they are none of the best or most discreet friends to the day, or the devotion of it, who, as if they had forgotten that they are flesh as well as spirit, do trouble themselves or others with little niceties and unreasonable scrupulosities in these matters, such as instead of advancing the interest of religion do not a little dis-serve and prejudice it; whilst they not only make those who are possessed with them proud, censorious, ungovernable, and more idly busy than the things scrupled at would have done, but give occasion to men of looser morals to speak evil of our most reason-

* "*Vide* Lightf. Chronic., sect. 20; *item* Hor. Hebr. in Luc. xiv. 1."

able and best-tempered religion, as if it had not a due regard to human infirmities, wants, and conveniences, or even to those very ends of piety and devotion which we affirm, and affirm truly, to be intended and promoted by it.

"But then I would have it observed, that the relaxation here allowed and defended is no more, and no other, than is fairly consistent with the due sanctification of our Lord's Day. For I have admitted of no recreation or divertisement whatsoever, but what is for the kind or quality lawful, innocent, and inoffensive; for the time of using it reasonable; for the manner decent and becoming; and for the degree or measure moderate." (Pp. 223–5.)

Of the first promoters of the *Book of Sports* he speaks with unusual respect: "We have learned by a late experience the ill consequences of abused liberty; I say, abused; for though I shall not pretend to justify any such liberties, yet I doubt not to say that the liberty which made, or occasioned rather, such a noise and ferment in the last age, had been more excusable, if it had not been abused, and much more excusable if it had not been so liable to be abused. Nor do I in the least doubt, but that before such experience men of great piety and integrity, as well as sense and learning, were really persuaded, that the liberty then granted was in that juncture as seasonable and convenient, as it was undoubtedly well designed."* (P. 233.)

* On this subject the following opinion (partly quoted before) is expressed by Southey in his *Book of the Church*, chap. xvii., p. 447, 4th edition:—

"Laud was loudly arraigned for profaneness, because the King, as his father had done before him, published a Declaration authorizing lawful sports on Sundays, in opposition to the Sabbatarian notions with which the Puritans were possessed. These factious people, although impatient of any observances which the institutions of their country enjoined, were willing to have imposed upon themselves and others obligations far more burdensome: they would have taken Moses for their lawgiver, so ill did they understand the spirit of the Gospel; and they adopted the rabbinical superstitions concerning the Sabbath, overlooking or being ignorant that the Sabbath was intended to be not less a day of recreation than of rest.

"The motives for this Declaration were unobjectionably good; but the just liberty which, in happier times, and under proper parochial discipline, would have been in all respects useful, proved injurious in the then distempered state of public feeling. It displeased the well-intentioned part of the Calvinised clergy, and it was abused in officious triumph by those who were glad of an opportunity for insulting the professors of a sour and dismal morality."

Coleridge says: "The English Reformers evidently took the same view of the day as Luther and the early Church. But, unhappily, our Church, in the reigns of James and Charles the First, was so identified with the undue advancement of the royal prerogative, that the puritanical Judaising of the Presbyterians was but too well seconded by the patriots of the nation, in resisting the wise efforts of the Church to prevent the incipient alteration in the character of the day of rest."—*Table Talk*, vol. ii., p. 316.

209. PATRICK, SIMON, D.D., *Bishop of Ely* (*born* 1626; *died* 1707).—A Commentary on the Old Testament [to Esther]. Lond. 1704. 9 vols. 4to.

This is included in "A Critical Commentary and Paraphrase on the Old and New Testament and the Apocrypha, by Patrick, Lowth, Arnold, Whitby, and Lowman, corrected by the Rev. J. R. Pitman." 6 vols. royal 4to. Lond. 1822. Another edition of the same collection, with the text printed at large (not formerly given), was published in 1853, &c., in 4 vols., imp. 8vo. See the comments on the texts most frequently quoted in the Sabbath controversy.

210. ABENDANA, ISAAC, *a learned Jew, who resided many years at Oxford, and elsewhere in England, before* 1706.—Discourses of the Ecclesiastical and Civil Polity of the Jews, viz., of their Courts of Judicature; Laws concerning Tithes; Institution of the Priesthood; their Liturgy; their Schools; their Feasts, Fasts, Coins, Weights and Measures. Lond. 1706. 8vo. Pp. 200.

In chap. vi., entitled, "Of the Jewish Kalendar," &c., he says: "The first feast or day of observation which falls under our cognisance is the Sabbath, or day of rest, being the seventh day which God Almighty blessed and sanctified, because that on it he rested from His work of creation; from whence the observation of it is derived to us by a regular circulation, as we shall endeavour to make out. That the Patriarchs did so observe it is highly probable, because the Scripture is positive that Abraham kept the Divine commandments, amongst which it is not likely the observation of the Sabbath was neglected by him; nor can any proof to the contrary be produced. But we shall not insist peremptorily on this, because we shall not lay any stress upon it. The grounds of our certainty in this matter we derive from the time of the manna in the wilderness of Sinai. For the Scripture assures us that the manna did not fall on the seventh day, and the reason is because that was the Sabbath; and it is here very remarkable that the text expressly says, 'Behold God hath given you the Sabbath-day,' and therefore He did not then first institute it. But now we know of no other Sabbath which God had given them but that only on which he rested from all his works, and that which he blessed and sanctified; and therefore he obliged them to the precise observation of that Sabbath; and consequently, however careless or forgetful the whole nation might be thought to have been, yet God Almighty undoubtedly knew the precise day, and here reminded them of their obligation to sanctify it; and this is agreeable to the judgment of Philo Judæus and other Fathers in this particular. And it is further remarkable to this purpose, that in the

Fourth Commandment we are commanded to 'remember the Sabbath-day,' which therefore must have been enjoined before, and consequently could be no other than the seventh in a regular circulation from the Sabbath of the creation; for we know of no other. Lastly, it is yet further remarkable, that whereas in the 9th chap. and 13th verse of Nehemiah it is said, 'Thou (O God) gavest them right judgments,' &c., it is added in the 14th verse, 'and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath,' and at the 15th verse, 'And gavest them bread from heaven;' hence we may observe that the Almighty plainly declared (by the sending of the manna) which was the Sabbath, whereon he rested from all his works, and which he commanded to be thenceforward observed by all those to whom he vouchsafed to give the manna; and therefore hereby we certainly know the precise Sabbath, and accordingly celebrate it, which God Almighty blessed and sanctified. Now, to say that any seventh day after six days of usual labour will answer the design of the institution of the Sabbath, is not only improbable, and so fit to be rejected by us, but overthrows the very ground of the Fourth Commandment; which is, that therefore we are to keep holy the Sabbath-day (not the seventh day), because that on it God rested from all his work. And to say he rested from his works any seventh day, seems a very harsh interpretation; and therefore must we understand it precisely of the Sabbath immediately ensuing the work of the creation; and consequently that is the precise day we are obliged to celebrate, called the Sabbath by way of eminence, and as such distinguished from all other whether seventh day or days of rest. Hence Jonathan in his Chaldee Paraphrase ascribes a peculiar excellency to this Sabbath, saying, 'God blessed and sanctified it before all other days, all other days in the week.' And if we be charged to have forgot it, and instead thereof to have adopted another quite different from it, this is what no tolerable proof can be given of. That it might possibly be forgotten is what we need not dispute, but to infer from thence that it was actually forgot is a very precarious conclusion; especially if we consider the great improbability there is that a whole nation which constantly computed their measures and periods of time by weeks, should forget one whole day in seven; or that if they had at any time been so forgetful, none of the prophets or holy men whom it pleased God continually to raise up unto them should reprove them for it. . . . . Besides, it may be considered that notwithstanding the many great corruptions and idolatrous practices of our church and nation, there were yet constantly some pious and upright men, who were careful observers of the Divine law; even in that defection and apostacy under which God was pleased to declare he had reserved to himself 7000 men, who had not bowed the knee to the image of Baal, 1 Kings xix. 18. And is it at all probable these should utterly forget one of the ten commandments and express no concern for the observation of the Sabbath? But further, if all this be not thought satisfactory, we add, that however likely it may appear to some that a whole nation should for-

get one day in seven, and however strongly they may fancy that it is even so; yet it was not possible (as we have said) that God Almighty should forget it. Now we are assured he was pleased to renew the remembrance of it, in giving of the manna in the wilderness, Exod. xvi.; I say to renew it (if indeed it was forgot, which we have already made out to be very improbable); and consequently from that time at least we go upon sure grounds as to our conduct in this affair." (Pp. 178–182.)

211. HAMERSLEY, RICHARD.—Advice to Sunday Barbers against Trimming on the Lord's Day. Lond. 1706. 8vo.

212. STRYK, JOHN SAMUEL, *a German Jurist.*—Commentatio de Jure Sabbathi, quam, cum ejusdem programmate de incommodis Festorum, observationibus notatis auxit J. G. G. Volkhartus. Jenæ, 1756. 4to.

"In Germany," says Hengstenberg, "the agitation of the Sabbath question in Holland (see above, p. 6.) was watched with great attention. The more stringent views, which commended themselves by the appearance of greater piety, and promised to do much to stop the prevalent neglect of the Sunday, were preferred by most of the theologians to those contained in the works of the Reformers. But they were kept very quiet during the whole of the second half of the seventeenth century, from a knowledge that they were held in direct opposition to the powerful authority of the Confessions of Faith. In 1688, however, Fecht, a theologian at Rostock, entered the lists against these views, and amongst other things, quoted the whole list of historical witnesses against them, whom many would gladly have buried in oblivion. No one ventured to oppose him. But this did not prevent their gaining fresh adherents, with such rapidity, that at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the more zealous advocates, believing that nearly all the orthodox theologians were on their side, ventured to make a fierce assault upon the few who still defended the more liberal views." (*The Lord's Day*, pp. 70, 71.)

After mentioning the slight contest excited by Lünekogel in 1700 (above, p. 119), Hengstenberg proceeds: "Far more important was the agitation caused by the work of Stryk, a jurist in Halle, on the Sabbath. This man, who was actuated by truly religious zeal, and inclined to the views of the pietists, was led especially to oppose the doctrine which had become prevalent regarding the Sabbath, from the fact that it seemed to him to promote generally a merely external fear of God, a kind of Christian pharisaism. He himself says, in his answer to Mayer, which appeared in 1707: 'This dissertation is written with no other object than to show how, in the present day, men are relying upon out-

ward worship alone, so that the real inward worship, the worship in spirit and in truth, is almost entirely forgotten.' He borrowed his weapons chiefly from Spener. In the first part of the treatise, which consists of four chapters, he treats of the origin and progress of the Sabbath, and its force under the New Testament. He maintains that the Sabbath was not prescribed by any law before the time of Moses. From this it follows that it affects the children of Israel alone. This is still further confirmed by the fact, that the reason stated for the institution of the Sabbath only applies to the Jews. It is said to be appointed, in order that they may be reminded on the Sabbath of their bondage in Egypt; that the Sabbath may be a special sign between God and the Jewish people; and that the children of Israel may be preserved by it from idolatry. If the commandment had been a moral one, no alteration could have taken place under the New Testament in reference to the day. The Sunday of Christians does not stand on any common ground with the Sabbath of the Jews. It has not been introduced by a direct Divine command; for it cannot be proved that the observance of it originated with the apostles; and even if it could, they evidently did not wish to lay down any law with regard to it. The observance of the Sunday rests entirely upon a simple arrangement of the Church. In the second chapter the author proceeds, on this ground, to examine the rights and duties of a government with respect to the Sunday. He maintains that a prince has authority to appoint another day for public worship instead of Sunday, though this would be a decidedly imprudent course. His duty, in reference to the Sunday, is to see that the design of it is secured. He must therefore make a difference between his subjects. The rude and inexperienced in Christianity he must urge to attend upon public worship; but the more advanced, on the contrary, who no longer need a Sunday, he has full liberty to leave to themselves. Such men serve God at all times in spirit and in truth, and must therefore enjoy the full liberty which Christ has gained for them. All worldly amusements, which interfere with the design of the Sunday, ought to be forbidden. In the third chapter he treats of the rights of individual Christians. He maintains that the Christian ought to be bound to no day, as that on which he must worship, but that he has a perfect right to set apart now one day, and now another, for the worship of God, as the Spirit prompts him. But this right does not belong to all who bear the name of Christians, but only to the true members of Christ and the new covenant, with whom the whole life and every day is nothing else than a Sabbath. But those who are not established in the true faith are bound to keep the Sunday, not because of the commandment of the Old Testament, but from a knowledge of their condition, which makes the observance of the Sunday a useful arrangement of the Church.

"This work," continues Hengstenberg, "as we may easily imagine from its contents, excited great attention. It was soon translated into German; and by the year 1715 had reached the fifth

edition. The author, too, threw his opponents into perplexity by a reprint of the treatise of Fecht, with a preface of his own, in which he maintained that he needed no further defence, since this theologian, whose opinion agreed with his own, had never been answered. The large number of his opponents showed how deeply rooted the views he attacked had by this time become. Nearly all of them, however, instead of attacking the false spiritualism so apparent in this work, and whose nakedness, when applied to the Sabbath, we shall discover when we discuss the subject presently, directed all their efforts to defend the moral nature of the Mosaic Sabbath commandment. The 'moral nature of the Sabbath' was a favourite theme for academical exercises for many years.

"The opponents of the Sabbath did not omit to appeal to the authority of the articles of belief. 'Our articles of belief,' says a writer in 1703, 'are brought forward *against the opinion of all our teachers*, with the complaint that the people are compelled to swear upon these books, and yet those opinions are condemned which are in accordance with them.' We can see at once what perplexity would be caused by such an appeal: but the means resorted to for escaping from it—the forced interpretations by which the clearest passages were made obscure—are too miserable to deserve quotation.

"It is worthy of notice, that the opinions expressed by Stryk were rejected as warmly by the theologians of the pietist school, as by the orthodox, and that not only that they might avoid giving the latter an occasion of commencing a doctrinal controversy, but, even more, because the practical result at which Stryk aimed was counterbalanced by another which, in their estimation, was more important. The result which, even in Stryk's opinion, the Sunday ought to ensure, they believed to be unattainable unless the views which he opposed were firmly maintained. And they knew too well that, even in believers, the conflict between the flesh and the spirit is not yet terminated, to dream of perfect Christians who need no special times of devotion and meeting. Buddaeus and Walch defend the ordinary view;* and so also Spener, who has written at greater length than others on the subject. He thinks, however, that it is better not to carry on the controversy in too public a manner; partly because the consequence will only be, that men will indulge a liberty injurious to their souls and their edification; and partly because the Augsburg Confession is more against them than in their favour. It is better, he thinks, to recommend the strict observance of Sunday on the ground of experience. 'I am convinced that, if the people could be persuaded, for a certain time, to spend the Sabbath sacredly in honour of God, their own experience would advocate the practice most strongly, and would show them so clearly the will of our heavenly Father, who has

* Buddaeus and Walch were, in succession, Professors of Theology at Jena. The former was born in 1667 and died in 1729; the latter, born in 1693, died in 1775.

granted us such rest for the good of our souls, that there would be no necessity for further discussion on the part of those who watch over their spiritual interests.' He recommends others to test the question, by the same means which were effectual in his own case. 'I thank my God,' he says, 'who caused me to learn this important lesson, that I ought to abstain on the Sunday not only from worldly amusements, but from studies also, even though theological, by which I was seeking to advance in learning rather than in goodness or piety.'

"But Spener, though he regarded the Sabbath commandment as part of the moral law, did not overlook another distinction between the two testaments in reference to it, besides the difference of days. Under the Old Testament, in which everything was outward, the discontinuance of work, of that which was outward, formed a most essential part of the commandment; but since worship, under the New Testament, consists more in that which is within, the sanctification of the Sabbath is to be sought by us principally in the inward rest of the soul, and in giving this up to the operations of God; and outward rest is connected with this, only as a help to the rest within. Therefore, sports on the Sunday are more sinful under the New Testament, than the performance of the duties of one's calling, even though these consist in hard work. For, a few hours spent in amusements do more to disturb the soul's rest in God, than a whole day spent in work; since the latter may have been accompanied with thinking upon the word of God. The same is true of all *worldly studies*, of cares, of everything which rivets the mind and thoughts upon itself; for by this they all hinder the keeping of the Sabbath more than severe labour." (Pp. 71–74.)

Want of space obliges me to omit some further observations of Hengstenberg on Spener's book. Its author, I suppose, is the celebrated Philip James Spener, founder of the sect of Pietists (born 1635; died 1705). What its title is I have not discovered; but he probably treats of the Sabbath in one or other of his *Theological Answers and Consultations* (4 vols., 1700–1), *The Last Theological Answers* (1715), and *Concilia et Judicia Theologica Latina* (1709). These six volumes are said to form the best collection of Protestant casuistry extant; the answers not treating of vain subtleties, but discussing matters of grave importance and of practical utility.

213. KOELMAN, JAMES, "*Minister of the Holy Gospel.*" —Het Dispuit, en de Historie, mitsgaders de Praktijke van den Sabbath, en 's Heeren-dag. Amst. 1685. 4to. Pp. 1196.

This enormous Dutch volume, beautifully printed in black letter, was lately brought under my notice by Mr Small, the obliging librarian of Edinburgh University, but not in time to be men-

tioned at its proper place. Though by far the largest, it is in this country one of the least known of the innumerable books which have appeared on the Puritan side of the Sabbath controversy; insomuch that, in the course of my researches, I have never seen it even named. The copy in the Edinburgh Library belonged to the late Dr William Steven, minister of Trinity College parish there, and who formerly officiated as pastor of the Scottish Church at Rotterdam. It greatly exceeds in size the *Sabbatum Redivivum* of Cawdrey and Palmer (No. 122; above, i. 237), which I had previously regarded as the bulkiest book ever published in this controversy, and which Koelman frequently quotes. His volume, indeed, is mainly a compilation from the writings of the Reformers, and of the English and Dutch controversialists down to his time. These he seems to have studied most diligently; and when quoting any book, he is always careful to refer to it particularly in the margin.

The Dutch title above transcribed, means "The Controversy, History, and Manner of Observance of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day." The volume, however, consists of four separately-paged parts, containing—

1. Introductory matter. Pp. 80.

2. "The whole Controversy concerning the Sabbath and the Lord's Day: In which almost everything that has been propounded for or against the Christian Day of Rest by the Reformers in England or the Netherlands is collected; and it is fully and thoroughly proved that the Commandment of the Sabbath, and the Divine Institution of the Lord's Day, oblige all Christians to keep as a holy rest one day in the seven, and in particular the first day of the week. Amst. 1683." Pp. 708.

3. "The History of the Christian Sabbath: Showing, first, how the whole of Christendom has always kept the Lord's Day as a day of rest; and, secondly, what Controversies and Disputes arose among the Reformed Teachers in England and the Netherlands concerning the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, and with what result. Amst. 1685." Pp. 372.

4. "The Manner of Observing the Sabbath; or, The True Sanctification of the Christian Day of Rest, or the Lord's Day. Amst. 1685." Pp. 36.

To each of the second and third parts an ample index is added, giving easy access to their multifarious contents, theological, bibliographical, and historical.

From Koelman I have learnt the titles of the following treatises on the Sabbath question, which had previously escaped my notice.

HOORNBEEK, JOHN (*see above*, p. 6, *note*).—Beweering van die Heeren-dags Heyliging.—Sondag Rust-dag.—De Observando à Christianis Decalogi Præcepto Quarto.—Theologia Practica.

SCHOOK, MARTIN.—Exercitationes variæ, Exerc. 9.

BURMAN, FRANCIS (*see* No. 149).—Bericht van den Sabbath.—Vindiciæ Disquisitionis.—Apolog. pro Vindic. Disquis.—Synopsis.

STRANGIUS.—De Sabbatho et Die Dominica.

ALTINGIUS, JAMES (*see* No. 173).—Theses de Sabbato.—Sabbaths Leere van de Dortsche Synode.—Verklaring der Tien Geboboden, &c.

COCCEIUS, JOHN (*see* No. 141).—Summa Theologiæ ex Scripturis repetita; in Oper. tom. vii. Amst. 1701.

HEIDANUS, ABRAHAM (*see* No. 142).—Consideratien over den Sabbath.—Disputatien van den Sabbath.

RAVANEL, PETER, *a French Protestant Minister at Uzes, who died about* 1680.—Bibliotheca Sacra, seu Thesaurus Scripturæ Canonicæ Amplissimus; voc. SABBATHUM et DIES et FESTUM. Gen. 1660. Fol.

BREITINGERUS, JOHN JAMES, *of Zurich.*—Fondamenteele Onderwijzing van den Christelijken Sabbath.

MACCOVIUS, JOHN.—Disput. Theol. Miscell. Quæst., Disp. 23.

CLUTO, JOHN.—Idea Theol., Disp. 42., Thes. 24, 25.

JUNIUS, FRANCIS, *Professor of Divinity at Leyden* (*born* 1545; *died* 1602).—Prælectiones in Tria priora Capita Geneseos; in Oper. Theol. tom. i. Gen. 1613. Fol.

CUCHLINUS, JOHN, *of Friesland.*—Theses de Quarto Præcepto.

SPANHEIM, FREDERICK, *Professor of Divinity at Leyden* (*born* 1600; *died* 1649).—Dubia Evangelica, Pars iii., Dub. 116.

MARESIUS, SAMUEL, *a Protestant Minister at Groningen* (*born* 1599; *died* 1673).—Decis. Academ. Quæst. aliquot Theolog., Qu. 1–12.—Contra Volkelium de Vera Religione, lib. i. c. 15.—Systemat. Theolog., Loc. vii., Thes. 3.

FLOCKENIUS.—Theol. Elenct., tit. de Sabbatho.

UDEMANS, GODFREY, *Minister at Zierikzee* (*see above*, i. 218).—Practijk des Geloofs, &c.

TEELING, WILLIAM, *of Middleburg*, (*see above*, i. 218.)—Onderhouding des Christelijken Rust-dags. 1621.

STRESO, CASPAR, *of The Hague.*—Comment. in Acta Apostolorum, cap. xx. ver. 7.

APOLLONIUS, WILLIAM, *Professor of Divinity at Middleburg.*—Korte Aanmerkingen omtrent de Natuur en Onderhouding des Sabbaths.—De Lege Dei, cap. 6.

WITTEWRONGEL, PETER, *a Minister in Amsterdam.*—Œconomia Christiana, lib. ii. cap. 36.

DE WITTE, PETER, *a Minister in Leyden.*—Cathechisatie over den Catechism (over 't 4de Gebodt).

ARMINIUS, JAMES, *Professor of Divinity at Leyden, and leader of the Arminians or Remonstrants* (*born* 1560; *died* 1609).—Disputationes Privatæ, Thes. 77, De Quarto Præcepto; in Op. Theol. p. 346; Franc. 1635. (On the Puritan side.)

ERNSTIUS, HENRY.—Sabbatismus, sive Commentatio de Studiis Diebus Festis convenientibus. 1656.

VIGELIUS, HENRY.—Examen Refutationis Errorum Coloni in Doctrinâ de Sabbatho.

LODENSTEYN, JODOCUS VAN, *a minister in Utrecht.*—Een Kort en Zedig Onderzoek van 't Bericht nopende den Sabbath, en de Korte Aanmerkingen, &c.

Mr LONDON.—God's Judgment on Sabbath-breakers.

BURTON, HENRY, *a Puritan Divine, rector of St Matthew's, Friday Street, London* (*born* 1579; *died* 1648).—The Lord's-day the Sabbath-day. Lond. 1636. (Mentioned anonymously above, i. 187, No. 92.)

A Moderate Answer to Mr Burton. 1637.

FENNER, WILLIAM, *a Puritan Divine, rector of Rochford, Essex* (*born* 1600; *died about* 1640).—A Treatise on the Sabbath; in his Works, vol. ii. Lond. 1658. Fol.

WARREN, EDMUND, *minister of the Gospel in Colchester.*—The Jews' Sabbath Antiquated, and the Lord's Day instituted by Divine Authority. Or, the Change of the Sabbath from the last to the first Day of the Week, asserted and maintained by Scripture-Arguments, and Testimonies of the best Antiquity; with a Refutation of sundry Objections raised against it. Lond. 1659. 4to. Pp. 262.*

BROWN, JOHN, *a Scotsman.*—Causa Dei contra Anti-Sabbatarios.

214. BRUNSMANNI, JOHANNIS, Nidrosiensis, Sabbatica Quies, sive Vindiciæ Sabbatariæ: Hoc est, Dissertatio, in qua vera et orthodoxa Sententia, dicens, ad unicam in qualibet hebdomade feriam concelebrandam, Christianos quoque Jure Divino obstringi, et quæ pro ea, Sacris ex Scripturis desumta, militant argumenta, tum proponuntur, tum a contrariis exceptionibus defenduntur vindicanturque. Havniæ, 1707. 4to. Pp. 499.

The publication of so elaborate a treatise as this, at Copenhagen, shows how extensively the Sabbath question had been agitated in Denmark, and how weighty the opposition to the Puritan views of its writer had been. But so little attention does it seem to have ever attracted in this country, that, as in Koelman's case, I have neither found its title in any catalogue, nor observed a single reference to it by any English writer. The copy in my possession, which was found by chance in the hands of a London bookseller, is the only source of my knowledge of its existence.

Like many other champions of the Sabbath, Brunsmann asserts that it was instituted before the Fall; and he cites numerous authors, both ancient and modern, in favour of this view, besides replying to the arguments of its opponents. The keeping holy of one day in seven is held to be a necessary Christian duty, the Fourth Commandment being in substance moral, and therefore not one of the ceremonial laws abrogated at the coming of Christ. To

* I have transcribed the full title of Warren's book from a copy which has just been added to the Library of the University of Edinburgh. It is ably written, and was answered by Brabourne in a work mentioned above, p. 6, No. 146.

this conclusion the typical nature of the Sabbath is thought to be no objection; nor, he holds, does it follow that *Saturday* must be kept as the Sabbath. In opposition to those who believe that no Sabbath is to be kept by Christians, he quotes from the works of Ignatius that spurious passage in which the Lord's Day is styled "the queen of days;" as well as the doubtful sermon *De Tempore*, ascribed to Augustine (see above, i. 120, 123, 257). The whole Sunday must, he argues, be devoted to religious exercises: it was kept by Christ and his Apostles, and by the primitive Christians who immediately succeeded them; and it has ever since been kept by the Church. The doctrine of the Confession of Augsburg about the Sabbath and the Lord's-day (above, i. 130), is discussed in chapter xl., where the Scriptures (which he thinks it at variance with) are appealed to as the only rule of faith and practice. Regarding public worship, he infers from Lev. xxiii. 3, that it is a necessary part of the sanctification of the Sabbath. The second part of the treatise is devoted to the refutation of objections; such as, that the duty of keeping holy one day in seven is not revealed by the light of nature,—and that to require its observance is to act in opposition to Christian liberty. Lastly, there is an appendix in which the arguments of Altingius and others against the institution of the Sabbath before the Fall are largely controverted.

215. A Brief Defence of the several Declarations of King James I. and King Charles I. concerning Lawful Recreations on Sundays, commonly called "The Book of Sports," against the Cavils of Puritans and Phanaticks; with a true and original copy of the said Declaration. 1708. 4to.

216. The Book of Sports, set forth by James I. and Charles I. With Remarks upon the same [in vindication of Charles I.] Lond. 1709. 4to.

217. SHARP, JOHN, D.D., *Archbishop of York* (*born* 1644; *died* 1714).—Theological Works. Oxford, 1829. 5 vols. 8vo..

The third volume contains three sermons on the Fourth Commandment, Exod. xx., which are sometimes referred to as a sound and moderate exposition of the doctrine of the Church of England concerning the Lord's Day—since they avoid Judaism on the one hand, and the founding of the institution upon mere human authority on the other. At the beginning of the third sermon, Dr Sharp sums up as follows the contents of the two preceding:—

"My business hitherto has been to show that we Christians

are obliged to keep one day in seven as a Sabbath or holy rest unto God, and the day we are to keep to this purpose is the first day of the week or Sunday.

"As for the keeping one day in seven I showed, *1st*, That God making the world in six days, and resting on the seventh, meant by this action to lay a foundation for an obligation on all mankind, to whom the knowledge of it should come, to set apart one day in every seven to the honour and acknowledgment of that God that created the world.

"*2dly*, That God sufficiently declared that this was his meaning, by giving an express law to the first parents of mankind, and in them to all their posterity, that they should separate the seventh day, and keep it holy in memory of the creation.

"*3dly*, That though this commandment, through the prevailing of idolatry in the world, was in time forgot, yet when God came to restore the true religion to his own people the Jews, and to give laws about it, he took care to retrieve the memory of this commandment among the rest of the laws of the creation; accordingly he put it into his two tables wrote with his own hands, by which he sufficiently distinguished it from the temporary laws given to the Jews, and showed that it was of obligation to all mankind for ever, since all the rest of the Ten Commandments were certainly and indispensably so.

"*4thly*, When Jesus Christ came to give his laws to all mankind, and to set aside all that was perfectly Jewish in the worship of God, yet he all along seems to be so far from abrogating any of the Ten Commandments, that he lays great stress upon them, and yet the law of observing one day in seven is one of these ten.

"*5thly*, All his disciples, from that time to this, made a conscience of keeping this commandment as well as the rest; nor was there ever any Christian Church known that did not observe one day in seven as holy to God.

"In the second place, As for the change of the day from the Sabbath to the Lord's Day, and that it is this latter day, the first day of the week, that we Christians are to observe, and not the Saturday, as the Jews observed; I say, for the satisfying you about this, I went upon these grounds;—

"First of all, That the observation of that particular day, namely, Saturday, more than any other of the seven, was perfectly Jewish, nor did the law that required it ever concern any other nation but that people, and those that dwelt among them; so that there was no need of having that day abolished.

"*2dly*, That the observation of that day is not required in the fourth commandment more than any other day in the seven; but that it is sufficient, for the fulfilling of that commandment, that any one day of the seven be observed in the memory of the creation.

"*3dly*, That the reason why God pitched on that day rather than any other of the seven, was not any reason that did concern all mankind, but only the Jewish nation; namely, because on that

day he delivered them from the bondage of Egypt, by drowning Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea.

"*4thly*, That for the very same reason that Saturday, among all the days of the seven, was pitched upon for the Sabbath to the Jews, Sunday, among all the days of the seven, was pitched upon for the Sabbath of the Christians: I say, both these days were pitched upon for the same reason; that is to say, as in the old law, that of Moses, God would have the Jews observe a sabbath in memory of the creation, but yet would have it observed on such a day, that, together with the creation, they might remember their redemption out of Egypt; so in the new law, that of Jesus Christ, God would have the Christians observe a sabbath in memory of the creation, but yet he would have it observed on such a day, that together with the creation we might remember our redemption by our Lord Jesus Christ: which redemption was then wrought and effected when he rose from the dead: on that day was Satan and his host confounded; and on that day was salvation wrought for all mankind from a greater slavery than ever Egypt was: and this is the reason why we Christians observe Sunday for our day of rest, and not Saturday: and indeed, if we should do otherwise, we should shew ourselves Jews, and not Christians: we should not seem to own our Saviour's redemption; in a word, we might as well quit our baptism, and go back again to circumcision.

"Thus far I have already gone: there remains one thing yet to be done upon this head, and then I leave it; and I shall despatch it very briefly; and that is, in the fifth place, to show what evidence we have that the Christians, from our Saviour's time, did proceed upon this ground that I have named, and did keep the first day of the week for their Sabbath." (Pp. 235-8.)

The evidence which he proceeds to adduce is the noted "Six Texts," on which Bishop Pearson and so many others rely (see above, p. 18). And he concludes by showing, in a very forcible manner, how great are the benefits, to our bodies and souls, of a due and regular observance of the Lord's-day; and how much the diffusion of the Gospel depends on the weekly preaching of it.

Of the Decalogue he says:—"Whatever weight I lay upon the observation of the Sabbath, yet I do not fetch it from any obligation that is upon us from any of Moses' laws in this matter. The laws that God gave upon Mount Sinai by Moses did never concern any but the children of Israel, and those that dwelt among them; nor were they ever designed or intended to be laws to any other nation: and therefore the Ten Commandments themselves, as they were delivered by Moses, though we confess they do oblige us, yet they do not oblige us at all by virtue of that promulgation, but upon other accounts; namely, either the reasonableness and goodness of the matter of them, or some new authority that is stamped upon them. Whatever, therefore, is wholly Jewish in the Sabbath, though it be never so plainly required by God's law, doth no way concern us: and there are several laws relating to the Sabbath in the Old Testament that are of that nature; nay, and

some even in the Fourth Commandment (which, as I said, our Church owns in the general to be a law to us), namely, not only the fixing the Sabbath to the seventh day of the week, but also the strict rest both of man and beast on that day, which is there enjoined. But these things, as I shall show hereafter, were no part of the law of the Sabbath, as it is a law to us; and therefore we have no reason to concern ourselves about them." (Pp. 203–4.)

The drift of this passage seems to be, that the Fourth Commandment of the exclusively Jewish Decalogue, being a "*reasonable and good law in the matter of it*," would for that reason, even without promulgation to the Gentiles, be binding on them; but that, moreover, it was formally imposed by Jesus Christ on *all* his followers, inasmuch as he stamped his authority on the Ten Commandments, by enjoining, in his addresses to his countrymen, obedience to some of these precepts, though never to the Fourth itself. The former proposition is virtually repeated by Dr Arnold, where he says that "we are bound by *the spirit* of the Fourth Commandment, because we are not fit to do without the observance" of the Lord's-day (*Sermons*, iii. 286; Lond. 1834). But since *laws* only, and not their *matter* or *spirit*, can correctly be said to bind, it is probable that if the Church of England had not acknowledged the Ten Commandments as obligatory on her members, two such accurate thinkers as Drs Sharp and Arnold would rather have expressed themselves to the effect that the Fourth Commandment embodies a *natural*, or at least a *primeval law*, BY WHICH Christians, like all other human beings, are bound.* With respect to the alleged stamping of authority by Jesus Christ on the Fourth Commandment, it is to be considered whether any mere confirmation of a Jewish law can extend its operation to the Gentiles; and whether, indeed, our Lord in his discourses imposed *any* laws upon them. The proposition of Dr Sharp, that Jesus in person "gave his laws to all mankind, and set aside all that was perfectly Jewish in the worship of God," is thought by some to be one which the New Testament affords no adequate proof of. For we there see, they assert, that he addressed the Jews only; that, as a Jew, he obeyed the law of Moses himself, and enjoined his countrymen to obey not only precepts in the Decalogue, but sundry other portions of the Mosaic code; that he expressly disclaimed the intention to destroy the law; and that after his death it continued to be obeyed by his Jewish followers as before, and was considered by the Apostles themselves to bind those Jews as much as ever. (See Matt. v. 17; xv. 3–6; xxiii. 2, 3; Acts xiii. 46; xv. 7–29; xxv. 8; xxviii. 17: and compare with Matt. v. 17 the

* Archbishop Whately, speaking of the moral duties commanded by Moses, says, with his usual discrimination: "Of course Christians are bound to practise these and all other moral duties. But that is because these *are*, in themselves, *moral* duties; not because they are enjoined in the Law of Moses; which was designed for the one people of Israel." (*Introductory Lessons on the History of Religious Worship*, 2d ed. p. 66.) See above, i. 168, 201, 244; ii. 92-99.

texts referred to in vol. i. p. 48, note.) We know, they add, that Saturday continued to be observed by the Jewish Christians as the Sabbath-day, and to be designated as such; while in the whole of the New Testament not a hint occurs that the first day of the week was regarded by anybody as having taken its place. Dr Sharp, it is true, affirms in sermon third that "St John, in his book of the Revelations, doth in express words call the first day of the week by the name of *the Lord's Day*" (p. 240): but in reality *no* day of the week is mentioned there; and though we have some little extra-scriptural ground for the belief that about a century after the date of the Apocalypse the first day of the week was called by certain Christians the Lord's Day, the meaning of the phrase in that book is a subject of much dispute, and perhaps cannot now be certainly determined. (See above, i. 105, note †; and Domville, i. 121.)

Continuing to assume that the day intended was a day of the week, the Archbishop adds that St John brings in the phrase in such manner "that any one may conclude that he did not impose that name upon it, but that it was the usual name by which it passed among all the Christians in those days; and accordingly by that name it is called even to this day. What now can we conclude from hence? Certainly one of these two things; either that that day was appointed by our Lord himself for the Christian Sabbath, just as we call the sacrament of the communion *the Lord's Supper*, because it is appointed by our Saviour; and this some of the first Christian Fathers expressly assert; or else at least that all Christians had agreed together to consecrate and set apart that day to the honour of our Lord, and in memory of his resurrection, as the Jews set apart the seventh day in memory of their deliverance out of Egypt. Now which way soever we take it, it proves sufficiently to us, that the first day of the week was from the beginning the day that all Christians were to observe for their Sabbath; or, to speak more proper language, the day that they were more solemnly to dedicate to the worship of God and Christ Jesus." (P. 240.)

As to the former of these alternatives, it may be remarked, that, after diligent search, nobody has been able to discover in the remains of any of the early Christian Fathers a single assertion that the day was appointed by our Lord himself for the Christian Sabbath. *Other* reasons are assigned by those writers for the observance of *the Lord's-day*; but in no instance are the injunctions or example of Jesus or his Apostles referred to as such. (See above, i. 125; ii. 5.) And as to the Archbishop's second alternative, it may be granted quite consistently with the opinion that the observance of the Lord's-day was of human origin.

Dr Sharp, like Mede, founds upon *both* copies of the Fourth Commandment, as if both could be genuine (see above, i. 154–6); but this course, however common, is clearly inadmissible. He is also, as we have seen, one of those who conceive that by placing the Sabbath-law in the Decalogue the Divine Legislator suffi-

ciently distinguished it from the temporary laws given to the Jews; in other words, declared it to be a universally and perpetually binding enactment. Yet he afterwards allows that the strict rest of men and beasts, which is at least a chief part of what it enjoins, *was commanded to the Jews alone.* In fact he considers, with Grotius (above, i. 219–221), the Saturday of the Patriarchs to have been no proper Sabbath, or *day of rest,* but merely a day *blessed and sanctified; i.e.,* appointed to be religiously observed in memory of the creation, as the Lord's-day ought now to be religiously observed in memory of the resurrection of Christ. In reference to the Christian festival, he accordingly acknowledges, that, "when we talk of our obligation to observe the Sabbath, we use the word *Sabbath* in a very improper sense: for the word *Sabbath,* as it is always used, both in scripture and ecclesiastical writers, is constantly appropriated to the Jewish Sabbath, or Saturday; and therefore it is with some absurdity that a great many among us do call our Lord's-day by the name of *the Sabbath-day.* If any foreigner heard us express ourselves so, they would verily believe we meant Saturday, and not Sunday: but, however, since it is customary among us to call our Lord's-day by the name of *the Sabbath-day,* I do not refrain the use of it, especially at this time, when I am not treating of the particular day we are to observe, but of a day of rest in general, which may properly enough be called a sabbath, on what day soever it fall, for *Sabbath* signifies no more than a day of rest." (Pp. 202–3.)

Passing over the inconsistency of calling the Lord's-day *the* Sabbath, when it is admitted to be nothing more than *a* sabbath—and the farther inconsistency of making even that limited admission, while teaching that rest from labour on the Lord's-day is no appointed duty, but merely a thing accidentally necessary for the performance of religious duties—we are met by a question which the followers of Spencer and Vitringa may put; namely, On what ground does the Archbishop, who acknowledges in this very sermon that the word *sanctified* just means *separated from common uses* (p. 211), assume that although the separation mentioned in the Fourth Commandment appears from the whole tenor of Scripture to have been merely the separation of a weekly day of *rest* from six days of *labour* (see above, i. 3, note; ii. 78, 107, 112), the same expression, when used in Genesis ii. 3, ought to be understood as meaning separation for quite another purpose, namely, the worship of God by prayer, praises, and devout contemplations and studies? The very fact, that in the law of Moses enjoining the observance of a weekly *day of rest,* there is a declaration that "the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it, because in six days he made heaven and earth, and *rested* the seventh day," compels us, if we hold the sanctification of the seventh day to have taken place at the beginning, to regard that day as having been sanctified in the same sense *then,* as it was afterwards declared to be by the Fourth Commandment. Else, what becomes of the argument from God's example?

Dr Sharp considers the proleptical interpretation of Gen. ii. 2, 3 (see above, i. 107) to be unreasonable and ridiculous; but he admits that "the apostles and first Christians threw out of the Fourth Commandment all that was perfectly Jewish and ceremonial," *i.e.* the *rest from labour*, and the observance of the *seventh day of the week*, which it enjoined. If, however, "sanctification" in Gen. ii. 3, mean the same thing with "sanctification" in the Fourth Commandment, we must conclude either that Moses wrote proleptically in Gen. ii. 3, or that resting from labour is a religious duty incumbent on Gentile Christians, notwithstanding the declarations of St Paul in Rom. xiv. 5, 6, Gal. iv. 10, 11, and Col. ii. 16, 17.

In a sermon on the Love of God (from Matt. xx. 37) in the same volume, Dr Sharp makes some very judicious observations which deserve the special attention of those who, after doing their best to foster that elevated emotion, are conscious of being imbued with it far less than they think it their duty to be.

"As it is certain," says he, "that no man can be said to love God, or to have any sense of religion, who lives in a general neglect of prayer and other exercises of devotion; so it is likewise certain that, generally speaking, all men that do sincerely love God, supposing they be in health and free from the disorders that arise from hypochondriac melancholy, will find their affection so carried out after God, that they will with great vigour, and the utmost intenseness of mind, perform their devotions to him; nay, they will take a great pleasure and delight in so doing. Not that they think that God needs our services, or is any way better by them; but because they know and feel that they themselves are really better by thus lifting up their souls to God; by adoring his excellencies, and setting forth his praises; by meditating on his goodness, and paying their acknowledgments; by devoting themselves to his service, and recommending the supply of all their wants to his fatherly care and bounty. These being the proper methods of growing and improving in all virtue and holiness, the natural expression of the sense we have of God, and the love we bear to him, and the chief, if not the only means of maintaining and enjoying a real communion with him; upon these accounts, as they will take all opportunities that their time and business allow them of approaching to God, both in public and private, so they will do it cheerfully and readily, and their hearts and minds will go along with the service. And so far will they be from looking upon it as a burden or imposition thus to pay their constant tribute of prayer and thanksgiving to God, that they will reap great satisfaction and content from so doing. This we say, generally speaking, will be the temper of those that truly love God.

"But then, secondly, we say, it is not to be expected that even the most devout persons should at all times perform their offices

of religion with equal fervour, or with equal attention, or with equal satisfaction: it will unavoidably happen, what through the weakness of human nature; or what through business or unthought-of accidents, or twenty other things which may distract the thoughts; and what through the dulness and unfitness of our present temper for the exercise of these spiritual employments; I say, it will unavoidably happen, that even the most devout persons may be at some seasons very indisposed for devotion. And sometimes, when they apply themselves to the exercise of it, their minds shall be altogether so taken up and diverted by other objects (that have got the present possession of their thoughts), that they shall give little or no attention to what they are about; at other times, though they bend their minds as much as they can to the business they are doing, yet they shall find themselves very listless and cold and dull, and the whole performance will be very flat and insipid. At other times, it shall be even against the grain of their inclinations to say their prayers at all. There is no man so spiritual in this world, but he must expect now and then to suffer these inconveniences, even through the natural indisposition of his bodily temper, or through the distraction of his employments. It is a vain thing to talk of sitting so loose from this world, and having our affections so steadily placed upon God, that we shall be always in a praying frame. Human nature in this life will not bear it, and they will run themselves upon great hazards that do attempt it.

"But then, here is the comfort against these inconveniences, that generally they do not last for any long time. If we be at the present indisposed for devotion, or dead and lifeless in the exercise of it, yet in a little time we shall come to ourselves again. The fervour of our desires and affections towards God will return, and we shall perform our religious offices with the same heart and life and vigour that we used to do.

"But then, thirdly, you are to remember what I have now said only concerns those indispositions for devotion which every man now and then, at this or the other time, may find in himself. But now whenever it happens that this dulness and listlessness, and unattentiveness to our devotions, grows into a custom or habit, so that a man, generally speaking, performs them negligently and carelessly, and is hardly brought to them, and cares not how soon they are over, this is a bad sign, that the man either doth not love God so sincerely as he ought to do (as not having that regard to his worship and service which the true notion of the love of God will necessarily and indispensably put him upon); or if he did once love God, it is an argument that his love wears off and decays apace, and if great care be not taken to retrieve the fervour of his devotion, it is in great danger of being quite lost and extinguished. . . .

"But there is another case about dulness and flatness in devotion far different from that I have now been speaking to, and

which indeed the general question, as I put it in the beginning, hath reference to: this, therefore, I come, in the fourth place, to speak to.

"Fourthly, Therefore I lay down this as a certain truth, that there are some people who may be very much indisposed for all religious offices, and find a great dulness and deadness of heart in the performance of them, and this too for a long time together, and yet for all that be true and sincere lovers of God, and very devout and religious persons. It is so far from being impossible, that it usually and frequently happens, that some persons who used to be very devout in their prayers and religious addresses, and took great delight in them; nay, and so fervent they were in those holy exercises, as to be raised up many pitches above their ordinary temper in their devotions, and to feel strange transports of love and joy and consolation, whilst they were thus employed: I say, it is no strange, unusual thing, to see these very persons flag and abate so much, as to their vigour and fervour of devotion, as hardly to be able to pray at all; and when they do force themselves to perform their usual offices, they do it with so much wandering of thought and distraction of mind, with so much langour and feebleness, and with so little comfort and satisfaction to their own minds, that they verily believe all their devotion is gone, all their love to God, which heretofore was the comfort of their lives, is quite extinguished. What now shall we say to these people? Shall we say that they have lost their first love? shall we say that they are fallen from all that sense of religion that they formerly had? Yes, we should say so, if their decay in devotion did proceed from such causes as we spoke of in the last particular, if they were so careless and negligent and unconcerned about these matters as those were we now represented; but we suppose the case to be quite otherwise with them; we suppose they have the same concern and respect for all God's commandments that ever they had; we suppose they hate every thing that is evil and wicked, and pursue every thing that is virtuous and praiseworthy, as much now as they did before; we suppose that they have the same desires, and the same affections towards God and his service, that they formerly felt in themselves, and that it is their great trouble and affliction, that they can pray and worship God no better: in a word, we suppose that they do as heartily wish and study and endeavour to recommend themselves to God, and to enjoy communion with him, as ever they did; but it is their misfortune that they cannot raise up their minds and affections to him in their prayers and other holy offices as they were wont to do: all their delight in those things is gone, all the sweetness and comfort that they used to find in the worship of God, whether in their closets, or in their families, or in the church, or at the Lord's table, is quite vanished and lost to them; and this is the thing that troubles them.

"Why now, if this truly be the case of these persons, they need not trouble themselves at all; for I dare confidently say to them, that, notwithstanding all the deadness and dulness and flatness of

their affections towards God in the performance of their religious duties, they are in a safe condition, and they do as truly love God with all their hearts and souls as ever they did, only they do not enjoy so much the comfort and delight of it as they did before.

"The truth is, all this dulness and flatness, and indisposition for devotion, is to be charged upon the ill habit of their bodies, rather than any vicious affections of their souls: if the temper of their bodies was but well set right, the good inclinations of their minds would presently return, and all the joys and satisfactions and comforts along with them: but now, how to do that, how to restore their natural tempers to their former briskness and vigour, is the work of another profession to direct, and not mine; only this it is proper for me to say upon this occasion, that as this dulness and heaviness and listlessness of spirit in the exercise of religious offices, doth, in such persons as I am speaking of, always proceed from an indisposition of body, and most commonly that indisposition proceeds from causes which they cannot prevent, and for the redress of which they must have recourse to the physicians; so sometimes it proceeds from such causes as they may prevent; and of those it is not out of my province to speak a little: I say, then, that as to the keeping up in ourselves a constant briskness and cheerfulness and vigour, in the offices of our devotion, a great deal lies in the discreet and prudent management and conduct of ourselves as to this matter, and the contrary effects we complain of are often to be ascribed to our own imprudence and indiscretion. One point of this indiscretion is this, when we are too eagerly and violently bent upon our religious exercises, and do not give ourselves reasonable rest and intermission; we would have our bodies so perfectly at the command of our spirits, that, by our goodwill, they should attend no other work but what serves to the promoting their ends. Some persons, especially young beginners in religion, are of this temper; they would be always praying or reading, or at least have their thoughts employed upon some serious or religious argument, and all that time that is not thus spent, is, in their account, spent vainly and unprofitably.

"But whatever these persons think, this is never the way to subdue the flesh to the spirit; on the contrary, by this means they quite spoil the good habits of their bodies, on which their cheerful serving of God doth all in all depend, and the consequence hereof will be, that though perhaps they began very briskly, and found a great deal of peace and joy when they first entered upon the way of religion and devotion, yet if they use themselves at this rate for any long time, they will not hold out, but will miserably flag before they be half at the end of their journey: if, therefore, any one means to go on vigorously and cheerfully in the love of God, and avoid this dulness and flatness of affection that is here complained of, let him not harass his mind and his body with too constant seriousness and thoughtfulness, but let him unbend himself at due times, let him follow his worldly affairs and business with all cheerfulness, let him not think that he is always to be so

intent upon the business of devotion, but that he may recreate and divert himself as other men do, and indulge his constitution in its innocent cravings.

"But I need not insist upon this, because there are not many that stand in need of this sort of advice: God knows, the most of us rather need spurs to quicken our endeavours and our diligence in the worship of God, than reins to hold us in. But there is another point of indiscretion in the conduct of ourselves, which I ought, upon this occasion, to caution against, because it often proves the cause of the decay of our briskness and vigour in the service of God, and makes religion and devotion very heavy and burdensome to those that use it, and that is, the too much tying up and fettering ourselves with rules and forms of our own making. As for instance, when we make resolutions to pray so often every day, and so long, and in such a form; to read so much of a good book, to forbear wholly the use of this or the other indifferent thing; not to give above such a portion of our time to our business, or to our company, or to our recreations, or the like. . . . . The best way to secure the performance of our duty is, not by binding ourselves to this or the other method, but by making it as easy as we can to our present circumstances: we must relax, if we mean to keep up the edge and fervour of our minds towards spiritual things, and would not fall into that loathing and disgust of them, nor feel that tediousness in them that we are now complaining of; we must, I say, indulge a great deal to our humours and tempers, and not always be forcing ourselves upon this or the other exercise, which is against the grain of our present inclination: thus, for instance, if I find that my attention will not hold out to the length of my ordinary devotions, why, in this case, let me not scruple to shorten and contract them: if I cannot pray with devotion and affection in my usual form, let me take another that pleaseth me better at that time, or use no form at all, but pray as my affections lead me: if praise and thanksgiving do better fit my present humour than confessing my sins, let me choose that, and let the other all alone.

"Thus also in all the other actions of religion, where no express law of God hath interposed (for as for the rules of devotion that you meet with in books, they are no laws to you, though they may be good directions); I say, where no express law of God hath interposed, there it is the wisest way to comply with our own inclinations, and not needlessly to cross and tease ourselves. By this means we shall make religion and devotion, by degrees, natural and easy and pleasant to us, and in a great measure avoid that coldness of affection, those wanderings of thought, that tediousness and dulness and dryness of spirit, which the unnecessary restraint and obligations that men lay upon themselves in these matters are oftentimes the occasion of." (Pp. 186-200.)

In the second volume, pp. 188-260, are three sermons on "religious melancholy and desertion," "loss of spiritual comforts," and "the devil and his temptations;" wherein a similar exposition is

given of the influence of the body, as well in health as in disease, on the religious affections; and Christians are warned against the mistake of attributing to supernatural agency, states of apathy and despondency which in fact are due to physiological causes. These valuable sermons, like the one above quoted, were the fruit, not only of the Archbishop's good sense and large observation of mankind, but also of his own personal experience in youth. It is recorded in his Life, that "soon after he came to Cambridge, his studies were very much interrupted by a quartan ague, which stuck by him a considerable time, occasioned, as he supposed, by his rising too early in the morning, and bathing too frequently in the evening. He returned into Yorkshire for the recovery of his health, where he was severely exercised with hypochondriac melancholy; the effect, as he believed, of his distemper. But it was an effect happy enough in the main, both for himself and others; for it gave him a most perfect insight into the nature of that kind of melancholy which, in innocent people, arises from an indisposition or ill habit of body; and enabled him afterwards, as a casuist, to treat admirably well upon that subject, and to be exceeding useful to as many as applied to him for his advice in the like cases. And perhaps few men had more applications of this kind than himself, which occasioned his writing a great deal upon the subject, as well in letters for private use as in set discourses, which were first delivered in the pulpit, and published after his death." (*Life of John Sharp, D.D., by Thomas Sharp, D.D., Archdeacon of Northumberland*, i. 11, Lond. 1825.)

Now, if it is not in the power—and so, of course, cannot be the duty—of persons made religiously dull by disease, to spend the whole, or a large portion, of the Lord's-day in devotional exercises, shall we judge more severely the case of that other and very much larger class of men, who, from natural coldness of temperament, or defect of brain, are just as incapable *in health* of lively or prolonged religious feeling, as the former are in *disease?* Assuming the truth of the proposition in the *Shorter Catechism* (which many deny), that the Fourth Commandment requires us, and required the Jews, to spend the whole day "in the public and private exercises of God's worship, except so much as is to be taken up in works of necessity and mercy,"—still, must not we give some weight to the Scriptural doctrine of the diversity of gifts? Can we forget, that of him only to whom much is given shall much be required; and that worship, to be acceptable to God, must be worship "in spirit and in truth?"

On this subject, see above, i. 172, 216, 241, 261; ii. 13–16, 25–27, 33, 76, 130; and *Sabbath Laws*, p. 71.

218. BINGHAM, JOSEPH, *Rector of Havant, near Portsmouth (born* 1668; *died* 1723).—Origines Ecclesiasticæ: The Antiquities of the Christian Church. Lond. 1708–22. 10 vols. 8vo.

This work, prosecuted under great disadvantages, is described as the fruit of a prodigious extent of reading, especially in the Fathers; united with great judgment, sincerity, and candour. "It remains to the present day the text-book on the important subjects on which it treats." (Darling's *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, p. 313.) The recent editions are—one edited by the author's great-grandson, in 8 vols. 8vo., Lond. 1829; two edited by the Rev. J. R. Pitman, in 9 vols. 8vo., the later of them dated Lond. 1840; and one in two vols. imperial 8vo., Lond. 1846. The edition of 1846 is a reprint of the author's own, and wants the improvements which the other editions have received.

Book XIII. ch. ix., relates to "The Times of the Religious Assemblies of the Primitive Church, and the several parts of Divine service performed in them." In § 1 it is set forth, that the early Christians had no certain rule for meeting in public, except upon the Lord's-day, in times of persecution, for the first two centuries; § 2 treats of the original of the stationary days, or church assemblies, on Wednesdays and Fridays, and what Divine service was performed on those days; § 3 shows that Saturday, or the seventh day, was anciently observed with great solemnity as a day of public devotion; and § 4 describes how the Church observed the vigils of the Sabbath and Lord's-day, and other incidental festivals of martyrs.

From Book XV. ch. ix. § 1, it appears that by certain canons of the Church all persons, except penitents under censure, were anciently obliged to receive the communion every Lord's-day.

Book XVI. ch. viii. treats of what the author calls "Sins against the Fourth Commandment, or violations of the law enjoining the religious observation of the Lord's-day."* He states that "the voluntary absenting from divine service on the Lord's-day, either in whole or in part, was ever reputed a crime worthy of ecclesiastical censure. To absent wholly, as heretics and schismatics did, by a chosen separation, though they met in private conventicles of their own, was esteemed such a violation of the law as the Church thought fit to punish with the severest censure of anathema; as appears from several canons of the Council of Gangra. Secondly, if men who were otherwise orthodox neglected, for any considerable time, to frequent the church on the Lord's-day, this was a misdemeanour deserving to be corrected by a judicial suspension from the communion. This may be seen in the canons of Eliberis, Sardica, and the Council of Trullo.† Thirdly, to frequent some part of divine service on the Lord's-day, and neglect or withdraw from the rest, was in those days a crime of a very high nature, and punishable with excommunication. This is evident from those

* Nothing that I have observed in *Bingham* gives the slightest indication that any of the Fathers who lived in the second and third centuries regarded the duty of observing the Lord's-day as founded on the Fourth Commandment. (See above, i. 125.)

† These three Councils were held A.D. 305, 347, and 692, respectively; that of Gangra, A.D. 324.

called the Apostolical Canons," &c. (§ 1). After quoting other authorities (by no means of early date), he thus proceeds: "All these canons suppose, what we have fully evinced in a former book (B. XV. ch. ix.), that the celebration of the eucharist was a standing part of divine service every Lord's-day; and that every Christian communicant who was not under penance was obliged to partake thereof, to fulfil the duty he owed to God upon this day: and, therefore, all such as neglected this part of divine worship were to be censured as transgressors, for contemning one principal part of the religious observation of the Lord's-day. I cannot write this without lamenting the hard fate of many pious persons in the present age, whose disposition would incline them to be constant communicants every Lord's-day; but they want opportunity in the present posture of affairs to execute their good designs. Such must content themselves with that of the apostle, 'If there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not;' and in the mean time pray to God to find out a method in his good providence to restore the ancient discipline and primitive fervour." (§ 2.)

And in truth it is difficult to see how those who argue for the duty of religiously observing the Lord's-day from Acts xx. 7, and the *Apology* of Justin Martyr (see above, p. 4), can consistently deny the duty of partaking of the eucharist weekly.

In § 3 it is shown to have been "an ancient and general custom in the primitive Church to keep the Lord's-day as a festival and day of rejoicing," and never to fast on it. On this subject Bingham goes more into detail than Cave has done (see above, p. 55). He then proceeds to give an account of the imperial and ecclesiastical laws prohibiting attendance at theatrical and other shows on the Lord's-day. The gross indecency of some of these spectacles, and the cruelty of others, are adverted to by Heylin in his *History of the Sabbath*, part ii. ch. iv. § 3.

Book XX. ch. ii. is "Of the Original and Observation of the Lord's-day among Christians." In § 1, the author founds on the narrow basis of Acts xx. 7, 1 Cor. xvi. 2, and Rev. i. 10, the assertion that "it was observed with great veneration in the ancient Church from the very time of the apostles, who are themselves *often said to meet on this day for divine service.*" (§ 1.) This practice he goes on to illustrate and confirm from the general usage of the Church in the following ages, gathered from Pliny, lib. 10, ep. 97, Ignatius' *Ep. to the Magnesians* (see above, i. 119); Justin Martyr's *Apology* (above, ii. 4); Tertullian's *Apology*, ch. 16; the Edict of Constantine, &c. In the subsequent sections, of which I copy the titles, he takes notice of "some special [imperial] laws and customs that were observed, to show a more peculiar reverence, honour, and respect to the supereminent dignity of this day:"—

"§ 2. All proceedings at law forbidden and suspended on this day, except such as were of absolute necessity or great charity, as manumission of slaves, &c. § 3. All secular business forbidden, except such as necessity or charity compelled men to, as gathering

of their fruits in harvest, by some laws. § 4. No public games, or shows, or ludicrous recreations, allowed on this day.* § 5. All fasting prohibited on this day, even in time of Lent. § 6. And all prayers offered in the standing posture on the Lord's-day, in memory of our Saviour's resurrection. § 7. The great care and concern of the primitive Christians in the religious observation of the Lord's-day. This demonstrated, first, from their constant attendance upon all the solemnities of public worship. § 8. Secondly, From their zeal in frequenting religious assemblies, even in times of persecution. § 9. Thirdly, From their studious observation of the vigils, or nocturnal assemblies, preceding the Lord's-day. § 10. Fourthly, From their attendance upon sermons in many places twice on this day. § 11. Fifthly, From their attendance on evening prayers, where there was no sermon. § 12. Sixthly, From the censures inflicted on those who violated the laws concerning the religious observation of the Lord's-day."

In quoting from the sermon *De Tempore*, found in St Augustine's works, the statement that "the holy doctors of the Church [Bingham says the apostles] have decreed that all the glory of the Jewish Sabbath is transferred to the Lord's-day," &c. (see above, i. 123), he expresses a doubt of its authenticity, and adds: "Some think this homily is one of Cæsarius Arelatensis, a French bishop, which is very probable; for the French councils, about his time, are very express in forbidding works of husbandry on the Lord's-day." (§. 3.)

Finally, in chapter iii. of the same Book, he treats of "The Observation of the Sabbath, or Saturday, as a Weekly Festival." Its sections are headed thus: "§ 1. The Saturday, or Sabbath, was always observed in the Eastern Church as a festival. § 2. Observed with the same religious solemnity as the Lord's-day. § 3. But in some other respects the preference was given to the Lord's-day. § 4. Why the ancient Church continued the observation of the Jewish Sabbath. § 5. Why it was kept as a festival in the Oriental Church. § 6. And why a fast in the Roman and some other of the Latin churches."

The answer which he gives to the first of these three questions is, "That it was to comply with the Jewish converts, as the Church did in the use of many other indifferent things, so long as no doctrinal necessity was laid upon them."

219. ADDISON, JOSEPH, *the most eminent of the British Essayists* (*born* 1672; *died* 1717).—The Spectator, No. 112; July 9, 1711.

* "But we are here to note," says he, "that such recreations and relaxations or refreshments, as contributed only to the preservation or convenience of the life of man, or had any tendency to promote the performance of Divine worship with greater decency or perfection, were noways comprehended in this prohibition of recreations or diversions on the Lord's-day." (§ 5.)

This delightful paper, descriptive of Sir Roger de Coverley at church, begins as follows: "I am always very well pleased with a country Sunday, and think, if keeping holy the seventh day were only a human institution, it would be the best method that could have been thought of for the polishing and civilizing of mankind. It is certain the country people would soon degenerate into a kind of savages and barbarians, were there not such frequent returns of a stated time, in which the whole village meet together with their best faces, and in their cleanliest habits, to converse with one another upon indifferent subjects, hear their duties explained to them, and join together in adoration of the Supreme Being. Sunday clears away the rust of the whole week, not only as it refreshes in their minds the notions of religion, but as it puts both the sexes upon appearing in their most agreeable forms, and exerting all such qualities as are apt to give them a figure in the eye of the village. A country fellow distinguishes himself as much in the churchyard as a citizen does upon the Change, the whole parish politics being generally discussed in that place either after sermon or before the bell rings."

220. NELSON, ROBERT, *a pious English layman* (*born* 1656; *died* 1715).—A Companion for the Festivals and Feasts of the Church of England; with Collects and Prayers for each Solemnity. 16th ed. Lond. 1736. 8vo. (Chap. I., On the Lord's Day.)

221. KING, PETER, *Lord Chancellor of England* (*born* 1669; *died* 1733).—An Enquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church, that flourished within the first three hundred years after Christ. Faithfully translated out of the extant writings of those ages. By an Impartial Hand. Lond. 1712. 8vo.

222. EDWARDS, JOHN, D.D., *Minister of Trinity Church, Cambridge* (*born* 1637; *died* 1716).—Theologia Reformata; or, the Body and Substance of the Christian Religion, comprised in distinct discourses or treatises upon the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. Lond. 1713. 2 vols. fol.

223. BURNET, GILBERT, D.D., *Bishop of Salisbury*

(*born* 1643; *died* 1715).—Some Sermons preached on several occasions; and an Essay towards a new Book of Homilies, in seven Sermons, prepared at the desire of Archbishop Tillotson and some other Bishops. Lond. 1713. 8vo. Pp. 349.

The fifth of the "seven sermons" is on the Fourth Commandment. Burnet, in writing it, evidently had before him the *Exposition* of Bishop Hopkins; for he repeats *verbatim* that prelate's definition of moral and positive laws (see above, p. 82), and throughout the sermon closely follows his line of argument. He teaches that the Sabbath was instituted at the beginning, and that the consideration of God's example in resting on the seventh day "is universal, and relates to all mankind; it being a true rule, that all laws are to be extended as far as the reason of them goes." (P. 297.) In reference to the commandment as expressed by Moses in Deut. v. 12–15, he says: "There are indeed other words added in Deut. v. to those here read (*i.e.*, in Exod. xx. 8–11); 'And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt,' &c." This, however, is a mis-statement of the fact—one which is very often, and perhaps inadvertently, made by writers on the Sabbath; for the latter words are not *added to*, but *substituted for*, those in Exod. xx. 11: and unless *each* of the two discrepant editions of the commandment may be accepted as an exact copy of the original precept inscribed on stone, surely we cannot with propriety found conclusions on both, as if both were undoubtedly authentic. Yet see how much is built by Mede on this double foundation!*

As for the change of the day from Saturday to Sunday, Bishop Burnet says that "as the apostles themselves met on the first day

* Above, vol. i. p. 154. The commandment in Exod. xx. is the copy always given by theologians as that which was written on stone; the other being left out of view, except when some argument is to be founded on the reason it assigns for the institution of the Sabbath. By one writer only, as far as I know, have *both* copies been asserted to be genuine. "If," says a reviewer of the Rev. Baden Powell's *Connection of Natural and Divine Truth*, "if, from its place in the Decalogue, the six days' creation is not entitled to be received as literal history, so neither is the deliverance from Egypt. Both are given as reasons for the observance of laws; *both were uttered in the course of that short but most solemn address that ever came from heaven to earth; and both were recorded by the finger of God on the same table of stone*, without the slightest hint that the one was not equally real with the other. And if such sanction shall not procure acceptance for the statement, no explicitness of language nor solemnity of asseveration can." (*Presbyterian Review*, vol. x. p. 732; Edin. 1838.) If both reasons were uttered by God, and inscribed by him on stone, why are not both to be found in each of the copies of the Commandment, recorded in Exod. xx. and Deut. v.? and why, notwithstanding the omission of one reason in each copy, are both copies represented in the Pentateuch as complete?

of the week, &c., *so they called upon the first Christians to meet together on it*" (p. 299); in support of which averment he cites nothing but Acts xx. 7, and 1 Cor. xvi. 2. He concludes by setting forth the manner in which the Lord's-day should be sanctified.

An improved edition of this sermon is reprinted in Dr Vicesimus Knox's collection of *Family Lectures*, p. 255.

Bishop Burnet treats briefly and similarly of the Fourth Commandment in his *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, Art. vii., near the end.

224. SALLIER, CLAUDE, *Professor of Hebrew in the Royal College of the French Academy.*—De la Feste du Septième Jour. (Mémoires de l' Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, iv. 45–67.)

This paper on the festival of the seventh day, was read by the Abbé Sallier before the Royal Academy of Inscriptions, &c., on 9th August 1715. It is a scholar-like production, in which he maintains briefly that the Sabbath was instituted at Marah in the wilderness, where the Israelites had their fifth encampment (Exod. xv. 26); and, more fully, that the evidence commonly adduced from Jewish and Gentile writers to prove its observance by the whole ancient world (which evidence he exhibits in detail), is utterly insufficient for the purpose. On the latter subject, see above, i. 113, 116, 117, 148, 258; ii. 88, 89. He interprets Josephus and Philo precisely as I have done, and agrees with Wallis as to the design of Clemens Alexandrinus.

225. WILLISON, JOHN, *one of the ministers of Dundee* (*born* 1680; *died* 1750).—A Treatise concerning the Sanctifying of the Lord's Day, and particularly the right improvement of a Communion Sabbath: Wherein the morality of the Sabbath, and its strict observation under the New Testament Dispensation, is maintained against the adversaries thereof; and also many special Advices and Directions given, for promoting the great and comprehensive duties of Sabbath-sanctification and worthy communicating. Necessary for families. By a Minister of the Church of Scotland. Edin. 1716. 8vo. Pp. 456.

The popularity which this work soon acquired is still maintained among the stricter sort of Scottish Presbyterians. At least four editions were called for during the author's life, in the latest of which he reduced it to about half its original size by omitting

the "Help for the Right Improvement of Communion Sabbaths." The book was reprinted at Edinburgh in 1840 (18mo, pp. 430). It is included in a collection of his *Practical Works*, published at Aberdeen in 1817; and which was again printed at Glasgow about twenty years ago, with a preliminary essay by Dr Hetherington on the life and times of the author.

The treatise is better written than most of the Scottish Puritan productions of its time. Though not beyond the range of Dr Owen's criticism above quoted (see p. 15), it is perhaps somewhat less exposed to the charge of overdoing than Mr Wells's *Practical Sabbatarian*.

Among Willison's reasons for writing it was a desire to counteract Limborch's chapter on the Sabbath (see above, p. 118), and also certain recent pamphlets by "one J. S., who calls himself a Presbyter of the Episcopal Church of Scotland," and who "pleads for Sabbath-day recreations both as lawful and dutiful after the public worship is over, providing (as he qualifies them) there be nothing immodest or indecent therein, nor too much time spent thereby: though he neither tells how much time he allows for them, nor what are the immodest or indecent things which he disallows in them, but leaves every man to his own construction and choice therein." (P. 132, ed. 1840.) According to Dr Hetherington, this J. S. was a Mr Small, of whom he speaks with indignation and bitterness.

Willison's opinion of Sunday recreations is thus delivered:—

"Recreations are twofold: 1. Some are natural and necessary, such as the refreshing our bodies with meat, drink, and sleep. These are recreations we cannot live or do business without upon any day, and therefore are both lawful and necessary upon the Sabbath, especially since we are thereby better disposed for performing the duties of the day. But,

"2. There are recreations which are voluntary and not necessary, freely chosen by people for their bodily pleasure and diversion; such as sports, pastimes, or games, whether more public or more private, such as playing at cards, dice, chess, tables, &c., or any sort of carnal music, such as whistling, singing, or playing on an instrument, or putting off the time with worldly converse, jesting, laughing, telling idle stories, walking and talking idly in the streets, or seeking our pleasure in the fields, though it be after public worship is over. Now, all such recreations being our own works, and for our own pleasure, and not subservient to the duties of God's worship, but hindrances thereto, are unlawful on the Sabbath-day, as being expressly contrary to that rest required in the Fourth Command, and to that plain word in Isa. lviii. 13, 14, 'If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable, and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasures, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage

of Jacob,' &c.* Now, can there be any thing more directly levelled against carnal recreations, idle talking, walking, &c., on the Sabbath-day than this is? 'We must turn away our foot from doing our own pleasure on it,' *i.e.*, by travelling or walking for pleasure or recreation; nay, we must neither do our own ways, speak our own words, nor find our own pleasures on this day. But if people will, notwithstanding hereof, allow themselves in idle diversions and loose recreations upon the Sabbath, I see not how they will free themselves of open rebellion against God: For God commands us to remember the Sabbath-day, not to delight ourselves by carnal recreations, but to keep it holy by Divine exercises; and to spend it otherwise is plainly to trample upon God's authority and declare war against Him." (Pp. 119–120.)

The words of Isaiah here founded on are, however, differently understood by some (see above, i. 171, 206); and besides, it has been questioned whether a prophetic admonition to the Jews ought to be regarded as a rule of duty for Gentile Christians, who, in this particular case, are evidently not entitled to look for the promised reward of being made "to ride upon the high places of the earth," and being "fed with the heritage of Jacob thy father."

Willison holds that the Fourth Commandment orders nothing more special than the observance of *one day in seven*; "though yet I grant," he adds, "that the observation of the seventh, or last day of the week, for the Sabbath, is so enjoined by that command, that none could have altered it from that day to another but He that is Lord of the Sabbath." (P. 39.) Elsewhere he affirms that "all the primitive Fathers are very positive concerning the Divine authority of this change;" but the proof adduced for so strong an assertion is wonderfully small. It consists of two scraps, one of which is the notoriously spurious passage in an epistle of Ignatius, where that apostolic Father is made to say, "Let every lover of Christ celebrate the Lord's-day, which is consecrated to our Lord's resurrection, and is the queen and chief of all days." (See above, i. 120, 259.) This passage, even were it genuine, would be palpably insufficient to warrant the conclusion drawn from it. The second is an extract from the homily *De Tempore*, which Willison quotes as Augustine's, but which is universally admitted by scholars to be of doubtful, and probably of later authorship. (See above, i. 123, 257; ii. 154.) But supposing Augustine to have really written that "the Apostles and apostolic men† appointed the Lord's-day to be kept with religious solemnity, because on it our Saviour rose from the dead," can a Bishop who died in the year 430 be fairly styled a "primitive Father?" Is an original assertion by so late a writer, as to the doings of the Apostles, worthy of credit? And, after all, is there any real identity between the appointment of the observance of the Lord's-day, and the change of the Sabbath-day from Saturday to Sunday? The truth is, that the author of the homily,

* Willison, for some reason, omits "*thy father*" after "Jacob."
† Willison omits the apostolic men.

no more than any of the primitive Fathers, confounds the two institutions, or puts the Lord's-day anywise on the same basis with the Sabbath—though he assigns several reasons why, as he says, "*the holy doctors of the Church* have decreed that all the glory of the Jewish Sabbath is transferred to it;" and adds, "Let us therefore keep the Lord's-day as the ancients were commanded to keep the Sabbath." Dr Cook, who evidently did not know that the authorship of the Homily is doubtful, makes the following remarks on the passage from which the foregoing extracts are taken:—

"It is evident that the object of this distinguished theologian was to rest the Lord's-day upon a positive divine appointment; he endeavours to show, that this may be deduced from the events which Scripture records as having taken place upon it; but not trusting altogether to such an inference, he introduces the doctors of the Church as having decided, that the only change made by the Christian dispensation upon the Fourth Commandment was to transfer the rest which it enjoins from the seventh day of the week to the first. Assuming this, he immediately holds it forth, or considers it as a matter of divine appointment, that the Lord's-day was to be observed in all respects as the Jewish Sabbath had been. This is certainly proceeding much farther than the New Testament seems to warrant, or even, if we may judge from their works, than is warranted by the earliest writers of the Church: and it is difficult to conceive, that when the apostles rank the Sabbath as amongst the Jewish rites abolished by Christianity, they should not have given even the most distant intimation, that all which they meant by this assertion was, that, on account of the resurrection of Christ, God was to be worshipped on the first day of the week instead of the seventh." (*General and Historical View of Christianity*, ii. 301.)

It seems to me that the mention here made by Dr Cook of the Fourth Commandment as a law considered by the homilist to be binding on the Christian Church, has no sufficient warrant in the words of the homilist himself. This at least is certain, that neither Augustine in his undisputed writings, nor any earlier Father, has referred to the Fourth Commandment as a ground for the duty of observing the Lord's Day as a time for Christian worship.

Among his proofs for the divine authority of the Lord's Day, Willison includes "the judgments which often follow upon the violation thereof." Many instances are transferred from the pages of former writers,—among others that notable one of the hunting nobleman who was punished by having a child with a dog's head. (See above, i. 149.) After this time the miracle disappears from the scene, though down to the present day many less marvellous instances of supposed judgments of the Almighty on Sabbath-breakers continue to be proclaimed. Willison refers to the great fire of London as such a judgment, since it broke forth on a Lord's-day morning; and he proceeds to say, that "likewise in Edinburgh, where Sabbath-breaking very much abounded (as

appears by the acts of the Assembly made against that sin), the fairest and stateliest of its buildings in the Parliament Close and about it (to which scarce any in Britain were comparable), were on the 4th of February 1700 (being the Lord's Day), burnt down and laid in ashes and ruins in the space of a few hours, to the astonishment and terror of the sorrowful inhabitants; whereof I myself was an eye-witness: And the effects of that fire are visible to this day. Yea, so great was the terror and confusion of that Lord's Day, that the people of the city were in no case to attend any sermon or public worship upon it, though there was a great number of worthy ministers convened in the place (beside the reverend ministers of the city), ready to have prayed with or preached to the people on that sad occasion; for the General Assembly was sitting there at the time: But the dismal case of the city made this impracticable. However, the Lord himself, by that silent Sabbath, did loudly preach to all the inhabitants of the city, setting forth to them, in a most awakening manner, the great sin and danger of irreligious neglecting of God's worship upon the Lord's Day, and profaning it, 'by doing their own works, and finding their own pleasures.'" (Pp. 92-93.)

226. WROUGHTON, CHARLES, M.A., *Rector of Codford St Peter, Wilts.*—The Duty of keeping holy the Christian Sabbath, opened, explained, and enforced: With an Epistle chiefly addressed to the Dissenters, to bring them back to the unity of the Church, by showing the unlawfulness of an unnecessary Separation. Lond. 1716. 12mo. Pp. 74.

227. BEAUSOBRE, ISAAC DE (*born* 1659; *died* 1738), and JAQUES LENFANT (*born* 1661; *died* 1728), *French Protestant Divines, Chaplains to the King of Prussia.*—An Introduction to the Reading of the Holy Scriptures, translated from their French version of the New Testament, published at Amsterdam in 1718. Camb. 1779. (Reprinted in Bishop Watson's Theological Tracts, vol. iii. pp. 101–369.)

Bishop Watson justly characterises this as "a work of extraordinary merit," and adds that the authors "have left scarcely any topic untouched, on which the young student in divinity may be supposed to want information." They insist strongly on the fact, that, in order to a right understanding of the Scriptures, we must know and consider the time and country the writers lived in; their language and character; the religion, manners, customs, and

usages of the people with whom they conversed; and many other particulars of the like description. In the case of the sacred books, as of the other remains of ancient writers, "the same rules of common sense must be observed; we must have recourse to study and meditation, we must call in the help of history, chronology, geography, and languages; in a word, of what the learned term *criticism*, or the art of judging of authors and their works, and of arriving at the true sense of them." Though all saving truths may be discovered without much study and application, yet, "when we come to a close and thorough examination of the holy scriptures, we shall, unless furnished with the knowledge of the particulars above mentioned, be continually liable to mistakes, imagine we understand what we have no notion of, or, at best, but a very imperfect one, and find ourselves puzzled and put to a stand at every turn. For want of these helps, the scriptures are frequently ill understood, and ill explained. Some put abstracted and metaphysical senses on passages that contain plain and simple truths, and expressed in common terms. Others having learnt a system of divinity, instead of explaining scripture by scripture, by considering the context and parallel places, wrest the word of God to their preconceived opinions. Others, again, having regard only to the modern languages, customs, and manners, cannot but mistake the meaning of the inspired writers, for want (if I may so say) of conveying themselves back to the time when, and country where, the sacred penmen wrote. Hence it comes to pass, that the Holy Scriptures, and the Christian religion, are so disfigured, as hardly now to be known in the schools and seminaries of learning; where the heads of young students are filled with a thousand chimerical notions, entirely unheard of by the evangelists. . . . . In reading the New Testament, we must have always in our minds, that the gospel was at first preached by the Jews, and in Judea, the evangelists and apostles having been all of that nation (excepting St Luke, who was born at Antioch in Syria, and concerning whom it is not well known whether he was a Jew, or a heathen, when he embraced the Christian religion. It is very likely that he was a heathen by birth, but a Jewish proselyte, as we have observed in our preface on his gospel, and in St Paul's epistle to the Colossians). For this reason, we meet, in the New Testament, with frequent allusions to the Jewish customs and ceremonies. Their proverbs and moral sayings are often made use of; and for want of being acquainted with the style of the inspired writers, we are apt to be at a loss, and look for mysteries where there are none, by understanding literally what is only an allusion to some custom or saying of the Old Testament." (Pp. 108–111 of Watson's reprint.)

In a chapter on "the Holy Things" of the Jews, an account is given of their festivals. Those which were set apart for the honour and service of God, "were attended with rejoicings, feastings, hymns, concerts of music, eucharistical sacrifices, and a joyful and innocent exemption from labour; upon which account they were

termed *sabbaths*." (P. 210.) The weekly Sabbath is discussed in pp. 226-233. Whether or not it was instituted at the creation, and appointed to be kept by all mankind for ever, is a question on which the authors abstain from dogmatizing; but they "set down the chief arguments that render the negative opinion the most probable," and give an answer to the objections that have been advanced against it. (P. 226.) The Decalogue, they think, was imposed on the Israelites only; and "the observation of the Sabbath being then a part of the divine worship, and a fence against idolatry, as God was therein acknowledged the creator of the world, it was very expedient that this law should be placed in the first table, which contained the duty of the Israelites towards God. It is, moreover, to be observed, that this commandment is the last in that table, because by observing it the children of Israel could therein discover the grounds of the three first. The second reason why the law concerning the Sabbath is placed in the decalogue is plainly this, because it is an abridgment not only of the moral, but also of the ceremonial law. According to Philo (*De Decalogo*), the Sabbath was a summary of the latter. 'The fourth commandment,' saith he, 'is only an abridgment of whatever is prescribed concerning the festivals, vows, sacrifices, and all religious worship.'" (P. 231.) The writers agree with Spencer and his School, that "in the Scripture language (Exod. xxxi. 14; xxxv. 2; xx. 8) *to profane the Sabbath* is the same as *to work* upon it, as to *sanctify* it signifies to *rest*." (*Ibid.*) "Feastings and rejoicings were thought essential to the Sabbath, according to Philo, Josephus, and the Talmudists. (Philo, *De Vita Mosis*; Jos., *Cont. Ap.* l. i.) These, however, do not seem to have been of divine institution. It is only said in the law, that the Sabbath was appointed as a day of respite, as a *breathing-time*, according to the Septuagint; or as a day of *refreshment*, according to the ancient Latin version. This custom is certainly of a very long standing, since it is taken notice of by a heathen author (Plutarch, *Symposiac.* l. iv.), by way of reflection upon the Jews. There could be no manner of harm in it, if, satisfied with some few innocent diversions, and moderate mirth, they had not exceeded the bounds of temperance and sobriety, as they are charged by that author, as well as by St Augustine (*Tract.* 3, *in Joan.*), of having done. Jesus Christ made no scruple of being at a feast on the Sabbath-day. (Luke xiv. 1.) But such was the sensuality of that people, that they could not but soon make an ill use of this custom. Accordingly, we find some footsteps of it in the prophet Isaiah (Isa. lviii. 13, 14), where rewards are proposed to such as would not take an occasion from the Sabbath to indulge themselves in all manner of rioting and excess. It is certain that the Sabbath was a day of rejoicing, and that, as a token of it, they sounded the trumpet at several different hours, made great illuminations, and every one put on his best garments, and dressed over night a greater quantity of victuals than usual." (P. 233.)

The observance of Sunday they regard as "not of divine, but of human institution; . . . . if people do no work on Sundays, it is

because they may not be taken off from religious duties, but may have leisure to meditate on holy things, which is the end for which this day was appointed" by the primitive Church. (P. 229.)

228. WOTTON, WILLIAM, D.D., *Prebendary of Salisbury* (*born* 1666; *died* 1726).—Miscellaneous Discourses relating to the traditions and usages of the Scribes and Pharisees in our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ's time. Lond. 1718. 2 vols. 8vo.

Vol. II. contains—"Shabbath, a title of the Misna concerning the Sabbath;" and "Eruvin, a title of the Misna concerning the mixtures practised by the Jews in Jesus Christ's time to strengthen the observation of the Sabbath." Both are given in Hebrew and in English, with notes.

The work is noticed in Le Clerc's *Bibliothèque Choisie*, vol. xiv., p. 188.

Wotton is one of the writers satirized by Swift in his *Battle of the Books*.

229. FIDDES, RICHARD, D.D., *Rector of Halsham in Yorkshire* (*born* 1671; *died* 1725).—A Body of Divinity. Lond. 1718–20. 2 vols. fol.

The Ten Commandments are considered in Vol. ii. As to the Sabbath, see Book II. ch. 7, and Book III. ch. 5.

230. A Companion for the Grand Festival of the Christian Church, or the Lord's Day. With Forms of Prayer and Praise for the Assistance of Private Devotion; and Directions for the more devout attendance on the Public Worship of God, according to the Liturgy of the Church of England. Being a Supplement to Mr Nelson's Companion for the Fasts and Festivals, &c. Lond. 1721. 8vo. Pp. 234.

231. MARCK (Lat. MARCKIUS), JOHN, *Professor of Divinity at Leyden* (*born* 1655; *died* 1731).—Compendium Theologiæ Christianæ Didactico-elenchthicum. Groningæ, 1686. 8vo. Pp. 1004.—Sylloge Dissertationum Philologico-theologicarum, ad selectos quosdam textus Novi Testamenti. (Exercit. xvi. ad Actor. cap. xv. ver. 21.) Rotter. 1721. 4to.

In the former of these works, chap. xii., *De Decalogo*, §§ 13–16, the author expresses opinions coincident with those of Grotius about the Sabbath (see above, i. 219). The most notable of them is, that *resting from labour* on that day was a religious duty of the Jews only; a view which Marck maintains also in his *Scripturariæ Exercitationes*, quoted in Dr M'Crie's *Memoirs of Sir Andrew Agnew*, 2d ed., p. 94, where some comments on it will be found.

In his *Compendium*, p. 330, and more fully in the *Sylloge Dissertationum*, p. 473, Professor Marck maintains, in opposition to Vitringa and others, that public and private worship was enjoined by Moses to be practised on the Sabbath, and that accordingly the custom of publicly reading the law in synagogues existed from the time of Moses. It is not, however, from the Fourth Commandment that he draws his conclusions; the chief texts referred to by him are Lev. xxiii. 3; Deut. xxxi. 11; Acts xv. 21; Isa. lvi. 7; Psal. xcii. 1; Numb. vi. 23, xxviii. 9; Exod. xxiii. 15; 2 Kings xii. 10. For the high antiquity of the synagogue he relies, above all, upon Acts xv. 21 (see above, p. 114), where James says that "Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day." But it is mere matter of opinion, on which critics disagree, whether the phrase, "of old time," ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων, implies a higher antiquity than the date of the return from Babylon; and whether, if it do, the belief of James on this point must be accepted as infallible. Marck quotes the assertions of Josephus and Philo (see above, i. 116, 118), besides numerous passages of Scripture, most of which seem to bear but very remotely on the question at issue.*

* The general opinion of biblical scholars as to the origin of the synagogue appears to be now, and to have long been, on the side of Vitringa. Thus, a late writer says:—"The origin of preaching, as a religious institute, cannot be said to be older than the time of the return of the Jews from Babylon. No direct or definite instruction had been given to the Hebrew priesthood concerning religious teaching. Their services were almost wholly ritual, rarely embracing instruction of any kind. Indeed, it must have been vain to have exacted an aptness to teach from men who came to their office for the most part simply as being born of a particular tribe or family. Even the prophets were teachers only upon occasions. They spoke as events and their special mission required, and not otherwise. If the teaching of the synagogue existed at all before the Captivity, it was not until after that event that the institute so named became national. Even then it does not appear to have come into existence as the effect of law from the magistrate, or of exhortation from the priest. Every synagogue congregation was a voluntary district gathering of people for the purposes of religious worship and instruction. The time had come in which the people were to feel the want of such religious help, and with the feeling of the want came the supply. The synagogue, when it once made its appearance, was soon found, not only in the principal cities and the lesser towns, but in almost every village and upland district where there were people enough to form a congregation on the Sabbath." (*British Quarterly Review*, No. 41, Jan. 1855, p. 109.) See above, i. 38; ii. 107; Heylin, Part I. ch. vi. § 3, and ch. vii. § 11; Prideaux's *Connection of the His-*

He looks upon the Sabbath law as being partly ceremonial and partly moral; and thinks it clear that by "the Sabbath-day" in Matt. xxiv. 20, Jesus meant, not the first day of the week, but the seventh.

232. CARLOW, GEORGE, *a Seventh-Day Baptist.*—Truth Defended; or, Observations on Mr Ward's Expository Discourses from the 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th verses of the 20th chapter of Exodus, concerning the Sabbath. Lond. 1724.

This plea for the seventh-day Sabbath was reprinted at Stonington, Connecticut, in 1802, and at New York by the American Sabbath Tract Society in 1847, 18mo, pp. 168, under the title of *A Defence of the Sabbath, in reply to Ward on the Fourth Commandment.* The editors say in their preface:—"He was evidently a man of plain parts, not schooled in the rules of logic, but learned in the Scriptures. From that fountain of true wisdom, the word of God, he had imbibed a spirit which gives pungency and heart-searching character to his writings, not often found in books of controversy."

233. The Seventh-Day Man in his Vanity of his Jewish Sabbath, and presumptuous contempt of Gospel Rest; together with the Sabbath-day Error. Lond. 1724. 8vo.

234. A Treatise on the Religious Observation of the Lord's Day, according to the express words of the Fourth Commandment. Lond. 1724. 12mo. Pp. 168.

This book is ascribed by Cornthwaite (No. 252) to a Dr Wright; it is probably the first edition of the treatise No. 238.

The writer's notion is, that the Fourth Commandment is to be considered as an entire law, complete in itself, and fully explaining itself: "Thus considered," says he, "the express words of it have no confined or peculiar relation, either to the Patriarchal, Jewish, or Christian state; but are applicable to all of them equally, after the settlement of any one day in the week for their first Sabbath. Let the day be pitched upon the first, or the last of the week, as God shall direct; this law in express words requires, that six days

tory of the Old and New Testament, Part I. Book vi.; Michaelis's *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, Art. 194, 195 (vol. iii. pp. 150, 156, of Smith's Transl.); Jahn's *Biblical Archæology*, § 344; Milman's *Hist. of the Jews*, ii. 25; and Kitto's *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.*, art. SYNAGOGUE.

from that first Sabbath be for labour, and the seventh for holy rest." (P. vi.)

He observes, that our first parents being created on the sixth day, "the *first whole day* that they lived, was the day on which God rested from all his work, blessing and sanctifying it. It was God's *seventh* day, after six days' work; but it was *man's first day* of life and being. With this day, therefore, man must *begin* the measure of his time; and so after six days' employment about this earth, he must *go on* to make every *seventh day* a day of holy rest, as his *first* day was." (P. 37.)

Accordingly, he adopts the notion of Chafie and others, that the Patriarchal Sabbath-day was Sunday; that the early Gentiles universally kept this day holy; that the Jews were distinguished from the heathen by being made to observe the seventh instead of the first day; and that the original Sabbath-day was restored to them, and revived throughout the world, by Christ. (See above, pp. 40, 86, 101.)

That worldly prosperity is a reward of Sabbath-observance has often been taught; but few have connected the one with the other by any *natural* link of cause and effect. One of those few is the writer before us. "The Lord Chief-Justice Hale," says he, "is well known to have ascribed much of his success and renown to the observation of the Lord's-day. He would sometimes form a judgment how it should be with him the week ensuing, by his spending of that day. And some instances I have known of men in lower stations, and among the trading part of the world, who have been witnesses to this, that a religious observation of the Lord's-day has very much conduced to the good order and behaviour of those in their families, and has produced many blessings on their six days' labour and employments. And take it the other way, some also have owned, that when they have grown careless and remiss in keeping this day, then their affairs have begun to decline and go backward.

"Such testimonies are not the fruit of fancy or imagination only, but may be supported by most solid reasons.

"The good impressions made on people's spirits, and their becoming thoughtful, and growing in wisdom and goodness, by a right spending of this day, tends to form their minds to greater sobriety, and to give them more discretion in their whole conduct. And, therefore, as far as God sees it good for them, they are put into a likely way to prosper. They shall either gain temporal blessings, or what is better, if they miss of them. I have heard some express themselves with great thankfulness to God, for the merciful appointment of such a day as this, because hereby they were led to make proper stands in life, and so to review their past course and actions, and to order them more wisely for the time to come; which they had never done (as themselves acknowledge) had they not been led to a religious retirement from the world on the Lord's-day." (Pp. 126–128.)

It might have been added, that the Sunday's rest refreshes and

invigorates those who work hard during the week, and so fits them to work the more efficiently and prosperously when they return to their employments. The labouring animals also are well known to do more work in six days, than they can do in seven if deprived of the weekly repose.*

The remarks of Lord Chief-Justice Hale above referred to, are fully quoted from his *Letters*, in Mr Jordan's *Scriptural Views of the Sabbath of God*, pp. 180–4. "I have found," says he, "by a strict and diligent observation, that a due observance of this day hath ever had joined to it a blessing upon the rest of my time; and the week that hath been so begun, hath been blessed and prosperous to me. And, on the other side, when I have been negligent of this day, the rest of the week has been unhappy and unsuccessful to my secular employment; so that I could easily make an estimate of my successes in my own secular employments of the week following by the manner of my passing this day." An intellect unrefreshed, and a conscience ill at ease, are natural impediments to the successful prosecution of a lawyer's work, especially where the belief is so strongly entertained as it was by Hale, that the Almighty rules the world in a supernatural way, and punishes by his special providence every act of impiety committed by men.

235. CLARKE, SAMUEL, D.D., *an eminent Theologian and Philosopher, Rector of St James's, Westminster*, (*born* 1675; *died* 1729).—Sermons on Several Subjects. Lond. 1820. 7 vols. 8vo. (Sermon 161, Of the Nature and Ends of the Sabbath, in vol. iv. p. 169–183.)

This distinguished writer begins by observing, that "in all cases where neither any natural necessity nor moral obligation intervened to the contrary, there our Saviour was constantly most exact and nice in fulfilling every particular even of the ceremonial law;" an instance of which is quoted from Matt. iii. 15. "But, on the contrary, wherever any real necessity of nature, or any moral obligation, any work of goodness, mercy, or charity, came in competition, there he was always as zealous that the work of goodness or charity should take place of any positive rite or ceremony whatever,"

* At the Dublin meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, on 4th September 1857, Mr Bianconi, to whom Ireland is so much indebted for establishing and ably managing the system of public cars, stated the result of his extensive experience as follows:—"I found that I could work a horse with more advantage 8 miles a day for 6 days, than 6 miles a day for 7 days; and, therefore, I discovered that by not working on Sunday I made a saving of 12 per cent." It appears from the report, that this business-like statement of the commercial advantage of piety extorted laughter from the men of science; but the fact itself is neither ridiculous nor unimportant.

such as abstinence from work on the Sabbath-day; Matt. ix. 13; Luke xiii. 15; Mark ii. 24-27.

The nature and ends of the original institution of the Sabbath, and "to what degrees and purposes it still continues obligatory among Christians," are next considered. After adverting to the necessity of having fixed times for public worship, Dr Clarke defines the more special purposes of the Sabbath to have been—1. That men might continually commemorate the works of the creation, and acknowledge and praise their Creator; 2. That the Jews, to whom the institution was "renewed," might commemorate their deliverance from Egypt; and, 3. That servants and cattle might have a regular season for rest. With respect to Christians, he holds the commandment to bind them eternally and unchangeably so far as it enjoins humanity to labourers, and "so far as it is, according to the original reason of its institution in paradise, a time set apart for the religious commemorating of God's work of creation, and praising him for the things that he has made, and serving and worshipping him as the maker of all things."

The Christian "*sabbatism*," in Heb. iv., is explained to be the habitual practice of virtue here, and an eternal rest in heaven from sin, temptation, and misery.

"The ritual or instituted part of the Sabbath, which had relation (as a particular memorial) to the deliverance of the Jews out of Egypt, is abolished," he says, "by the Gospel; . . . but then, instead of the Jewish Sabbath, there succeeded, by the appointment and practice of the apostles, the commemoration of our Lord's resurrection."

It is evident that bodily rest on the Lord's-day is not regarded by him as in itself a Christian duty, however useful or needful *as a means* of performing the duties of humanity and piety.

In his *Exposition of the Church Catechism*, also, Dr Clarke treats briefly of the Sabbath, to the same effect as in his sermon. Two extremes, he says, are to be avoided; "on the one hand (and which in the present age is by much the most usual and dangerous extreme), that habit of spending great part of the Lord's-day in gaming, and in other loose and debauched practices, which has been encouraged by Popery, and which has to numberless persons been the corruption of their principles, and the entire ruin of their morals; on the other hand, an affected Judaical or Pharisaical preciseness, which usually proceeds from hypocrisy, or from a want of understanding rightly the true nature of religion." (*Works* iii. 682; Lond. 1738, folio.) Of the six days of creation he says, that "possibly this might be a typical representation of some greater periods." (P. 681.) The same volume contains a *Paraphrase on the Four Evangelists*, where the meaning of our Lord's doctrine of the Sabbath is excellently brought out, especially in Matt. xii. 1–14; Mark ii. 23–28; Luke vi. 1–5; John v. 1–17. The passage in Matthew is paraphrased as follows:—

"About this time it happened that Jesus walked through the corn-fields on the Sabbath-day with his disciples. And as they were

going, the disciples being hungry, and knowing what they were permitted by the law in such case to do,* plucked the ears of corn, and rubbing out the corn with their hands, began to eat it.

"But the Pharisees, who watched all occasions of reproaching them, observing that it was the Sabbath-day when they did this, said to Jesus: 'See you not how your disciples break the Sabbath? Why do you not reprove them?'

"Jesus answered, saying: 'God never designed by any positive constitutions, such as the strict Judaical observation of the Sabbath, and the like, to put such difficulties upon men as to hinder them from doing things absolutely necessary. For have ye not read how David behaved himself in a like case?

"'Do ye not remember, how when he was hungry in a journey, the priest (1 Sam. xxi. 6) gave him consecrated shew-bread out of the tabernacle, which in strictness none but the priests were allowed to eat; and both David and they that were with him ate of it? Now, if David be nowhere blamed for doing this, why do ye reproach my disciples for doing so small a thing as plucking and eating a few ears of corn on the Sabbath-day?

"'Again, do you not remember how the priests are by the law appointed to do several sorts of works in the temple upon the Sabbath-day, and yet they are nowhere accused for breaking the Sabbath in so doing?

"'You will say, perhaps, this was a case excepted, because in this case the priests were employed in the temple, and about the service of God, by God's own express command. Very true; and if so, then the business of men's salvation, which my disciples are going upon, and my presence, and my permission, will much more excuse them in this smaller instance.

"'But, besides, since God everywhere declares that he prefers works of righteousness and charity before sacrifices and the exactest performance of all positive laws and outward ceremonies, ye have no reason to accuse my disciples for being so intent upon works of greater importance as not to have made provision for a strict observation of the Sabbath in its Pharisaical and utmost rigour.

"'Especially it being evident of the Sabbath in particular, that having been instituted for the use and relief of man, and not to be a hindrance to him in the performance of moral duties, it may in cases of necessity be dispensed with by any man, and much more have its rigour relaxed by me.'"†

* "When thou comest into the standing corn of thy neighbour, then thou mayest pluck the ears with thine hand." (Deut. xxiii 2.)

† "Since on the one hand the phrase 'Son of Man' cannot without harshness be understood of any other than Christ, and since on the other hand some expositors, not without great arguments (and especially from the parallel place, Mark ii. 27), conceive it in this passage to mean only man in general, I have therefore endeavoured in the paraphrase to express both senses."

See above, vol. i. pp. 49, 57, 221; and vol. ii. p. 113.

236. MEYER, JOHN.—Tractatus de Temporibus et Festis Diebus Hebræorum, cum Animadversionibus in J. Spenceri libros de Legibus Hebræorum Ritualibus. Accedit volumen de Jejunio. Editio altera, innumeris accessionibus. Amst. 1724. 4to.

This work seems to have been originally published in the latter half of the seventeenth century. It is reprinted in the *Thesaurus* of Ugolinus, vol. i.*

237. LEWIS, THOMAS, A.M.—Origines Hebrææ; The Antiquities of the Hebrew Republic, in four Books. Designed as an Explanation of every Branch of the Levitical Law, and of all the Ceremonies and Usages of the Hebrews, both civil and sacred. Lond. 1724. 4 vols. 8vo. (Reprinted at Oxford, 1834, in 3 vols. 8vo.)

Among the subjects treated of in this elaborate compilation from the most eminent Jewish and Christian writers, the places of worship and the religious ceremonies of the Hebrews are of course included. To these is devoted the second volume of the original edition.

238. WRIGHT, SAMUEL, D.D., *an eminent Dissenting Minister in London* (*born* 1683; *died* 1746).—A Treatise on the Lord's Day. Lond. 1726. 12mo. (See No. 234.)

239. BATTELY, JOHN, D.D., *Prebendary of Canterbury*.—The Original Institution of the Sabbath. Lond. 1726. 8vo.

240. HILL, ROBERT, A.M., *Rector of Stanhow in Norfolk*.—A Discourse upon the Fourth Commandment, where particular notice is taken of Dr Heylin's chief cavils against the Sabbath, in his History of that Sacred

* Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum; complectens selectissima clarissimorum virorum opuscula, in quibus veterum Hebræorum mores, leges, instituta, ritus sacri et civiles illustrantur. Venet. 1744-69. 34 vols. folio.

The following pieces are in vol. xvii.:—(1.) Josaphta, seu additamenta ad codicem de Sabbatho, ab Ugolino ex Heb. Lat. reddita. (2.) Josaphta, seu additamenta ad codicem de commixtionibus Sabbaticis, ab Ugolino ex Heb. Lat. redd. (3.) J. G. Outhovii Dissertatio de Sabbatho secundo-primo. (4.) J. J. Syrbii Dissertatio de Sabbatho Gentili.

Rest; of the Arguments of the famous Dr Wallis, in his "Defence," &c. relating to the Patriarchal State; with several other incidental matters. Lond. 1728. 8vo. Pp. 156.

Mr Hill writes with moderation and fairness, but in a more sketchy and fragmentary way than I was led to expect by his preface, where he proposes to supply the want indicated by his observation that Heylin's book "has passed in the world for near an hundred years, without any tolerable reply," and that, being "drawn up with art and assurance enough to deceive those who are too easy that way, by this means it does mischief still." He contends mainly against the doctrine that the Sabbath began with Moses, and "the mean idea which Heylin gives both of the Fourth Commandment, and of the religious observation of the Christian Sabbath." At the same time, as we saw in vol. i. p. 179, he is by no means blind to the general merits of that writer's book.

In his 9th page there is the strange assertion that the Ten Commandments were placed by the English Reformers, "as the main summary of our duty, in the Church Catechism, *which represents the observation of the Sabbath as implied in that love, worship, gratitude, invocation, and honour for him and his word, which are properly God's due.*" But how do we read in the Catechism itself? "*Q.* What dost thou chiefly learn by these commandments? *A.* I learn two things; my duty towards God, and my duty towards my neighbour. *Q.* What is thy duty towards God? *A.* My duty towards God is to believe in him, to fear him, and to love him with all my heart, with all my mind, with all my soul, and with all my strength; to worship him, to give him thanks, to put my whole trust in him, to call upon him, to honour his holy name and his word, and to serve him truly all the days of my life." Here is not only no "representation," but not even an insinuation, about the observance of the Sabbath! Had such observance been thought a Christian duty by the Reformers, would they have thus passed it over in silence?

Another surprising averment of Mr Hill occurs in his attempt to show that the copy of the Fourth Commandment in Exodus xx. is the one given at Sinai, while that in Deuteronomy v. contains "a new edition of the Sabbath, such as was particularly fitted for the Jewish state." (P. 94.) Not only does he overlook the fact that Moses propounds the Decalogue in Deut. v. as precisely what was written on the tables of stone, but he proceeds to affirm that "that edition of the Sabbath *was never put into the ark* (the repository of the chief articles of the covenant), but only in the side of it, by the order of Moses, Deut. xxxi. 26." (P. 95.) But on looking at the verse referred to, it will be seen that what Moses ordered to be put in the side of the ark was not the tables of stone, but "*the book of the law;*" and on turning to Deut. v. 22, the verse immediately following the Ten Commandments, it will be observed that

he says to the Israelites,—"*These words* the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, . . . and he added no more; *and he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me.*" The breaking of the tables is afterwards mentioned; and in chapter x., ver. 1 and 2, he relates that the Lord afterwards said to him, "Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first, and come up unto me into the mount, and make thee an ark of wood; and I will write on the tables *the words that were in the first tables* which thou brakest, *and thou shalt put them in the ark.*" These new tables, Moses goes on to say, were written on accordingly; "and I turned myself," he adds, "and came down from the mount, *and put the tables in the ark which I had made*, and there they be, as the Lord commanded me."

Of the theory that the Sabbath-day was originally Sunday (see above, pp. 40, 86, 101, 168), he observes that "a certain learned author promises to demonstrate this, which was attempted some years ago;—of which I need say no more, but only that I shall be glad to see it effectually done." (P. 135.)

The reason why Jesus is nowhere recorded to have taught obedience to the Fourth Commandment is thought by Hill to have been, that "the Jews (to whom he was sent, Matt. xv. 24) were as excessive about this commandment, as their obedience was lame and defective in other points." (P. 127.) This opinion appears to me to be sound.

As an answerer of Heylin, Mr Hill falls greatly short of Cawdrey and Palmer (No. 122), with whose elaborate work he was probably unacquainted. From some of their conclusions he would have withheld his assent; for it does not appear that he regarded the Lord's-day as the Sabbath, in the same strict sense that the Puritans did.

His criticisms on Wallis's arguments against the patriarchal Sabbath are not such as to call for special notice; they will be found in pp. 41 *et seq.* One terse observation, in regard to the Fathers, deserves however to be quoted—"We reverence what's wise and good in them, but know no law of God or man which ties us up to their particular conceits." (P. 43.)

241. HALLET, JOSEPH, *a Dissenting Minister at Exeter* (*born* 1692; *died* 1744).—A Free and Impartial Study of the Holy Scriptures recommended; being Notes on some peculiar Texts, with Discourses and Observations on various subjects. Lond. 1729–36. 3 vols. 8vo.

In vol. i. pp. 152–173 there is a discourse maintaining that the Ten Commandments given at Mount Sinai do not oblige Christians; and in vol. iii. pp. 48–222, Expositions of the Ten Commandments, of the Lord's-day, and of Moral and Positive Duties. Dr Wardlaw, who discusses some of Hallet's opinions about the Decalogue, calls

him "a very acute and intelligent writer." (*Discourses on the Sabbath*, pp. 35, 44, 49.)

242. BEDFORD, ARTHUR, M.A., *Rector of Newton St Loe, in the county of Somerset* (*died* 1745).—The Scripture Chronology demonstrated by Astronomical Calculations, and also by the year of Jubilee and the Sabbatical Year among the Jews; or, an Account of Time from the Creation of the World to the Destruction of Jerusalem, as it may be proved from the Writings of the Old and New Testament. Lond. 1730. Fol.

At the beginning of this treatise the primeval institution of the Sabbath is asserted; also the universal use of weeks by mankind from the beginning. The author thinks that the Sabbath-day was the first day of the week, till it was changed under Moses to the seventh.

243. CALMET, AUGUSTIN, *a French Theologian, Abbot of Senones* (*born* 1672; *died* 1757).—Dictionnaire Historique, Critique, Chronologique, Géographique, et Littéral de la Bible. Paris, 1730. 4 vols. folio. (Article SABBAT.)

A translation of this well-known, but now rather antiquated Dictionary, by John Colson and the Rev. Samuel D'Oyley, was published at London in 1732. The last English edition is that of Charles Taylor, who appended "Biblical Fragments," and made many other additions and alterations. It is in 5 vols. 4to, Lond. 1830; and the article SABBATH will be found in vol. ii. pp. 485–491.

Calmet wrote also a Commentary on all the Books of the Old and New Testament; Paris, 1709–1716, 25 vols. 4to.

244. RIDGLEY, THOMAS, D.D., *an eminent Independent minister in London* (*born about* 1667; *died* 1734).—A Body of Divinity, wherein the doctrines of the Christian Religion are explained and defended; being the substance of several Lectures on the Assembly's Larger Catechism. Lond. 1731–33. 2 vols. fol.

The Sabbath is considered in Questions 115–121, vol. ii. pp. 266–268. There is an edition of this book in 4 vols. 8vo, 1814; and another in 2 vols. royal 8vo, 1844.

245. IKENIUS, CONRAD, *a learned German Divine* (*born* 1689; *died* 1753).—Antiquitates Hebraeæ, Pars i., Cap. ix. Bremæ, 1732.

246. BURNET, THOMAS, LL.D., *Master of the Charter-House, London* (*born* 1635; *died* 1715).—Epistola Secunda, annexed to his Archæologiæ Philosophicæ, sive Doctrina Antiqua de Rerum Originibus. Lond. 1733.

247. EDWARDS, JONATHAN, A.M., *President of the College of New Jersey* (*born* 1703; *died* 1758).—Twenty Sermons on Various Subjects. Edin. 1804. 12mo. (Sermons XIII., XIV., and XV., On the Perpetuity and Change of the Sabbath.)

These twenty Sermons are reprinted in his *Works*, vol. vi.; New-York, 1830. They were written about the year 1733, but first published in 1780, at Hartford in Connecticut.

In the thirteenth and fourteenth the following propositions are maintained:—"I. It is sufficiently clear, that it is the mind of God that one day of the week should be devoted to rest, and to religious exercises, throughout all ages and nations. II. It is sufficiently clear that, under the gospel dispensation, this day is the first day of the week." In the fifteenth he exhorts to thankfulness for the institution of the Christian Sabbath; and to the keeping of it holy, by abstaining from sin, and from all worldly concerns; by spending it in religious exercises, but especially by joyfully meditating on and celebrating the work of redemption; and, lastly, by performing works of mercy and charity to our brethren. For these propositions he brings forward the arguments usually employed by the Puritans.

The passage taken for the text of these three sermons is 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." The first sermon opens thus:—"We find in the New Testament often mentioned a certain collection, which was made by the Grecian churches for the brethren in Judea, who were reduced to pinching want by a dearth which then prevailed, and was the heavier upon them by reason of their circumstances, they having been from the beginning oppressed and persecuted by the unbelieving Jews. We have this collection or contribution twice mentioned in the Acts, as in chap. xi. 28–31; and in chap. xxiv. 17. It is also taken notice of in several of the epistles; as Rom. xv. 26, and Gal. ii. 10. But it is most largely insisted on in these two epistles to the Corinthians;

in this first epistle, chap. xvi., and in the second epistle, chap. viii. and ix. The Apostle begins the directions, which in this place he delivers concerning this matter, with the words of the text; wherein we may observe,

"1. 'What is the thing to be done concerning which the Apostle gives them direction, and that is, the making of a collection for the saints; the exercise and manifestation of their charity towards their brethren, by communicating to them for the supply of their wants, which was by Christ and his apostles often spoken of and insisted on as one main duty of the Christian religion, and is expressly declared to be so by the apostle, James i. 27, 'Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction.'

"2. We may observe the time on which the Apostle directs that this should be done, viz., 'on the first day of the week.' By the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, he insists upon it, that it be done on such a particular day of the week, as if no other day would do so well as that, or were so proper and fit a time for such a work. Thus, although the inspired Apostle was not for making that distinction of days in gospel times which the Jews made, as appears by Gal. iv. 10, 'Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years; I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain;' yet here he gives the preference to one day of the week before any other for the performance of a certain great duty of Christianity.

"3. It may be observed, that this is the direction which the Apostle had given to other churches that were concerned in the same duty upon this occasion; he had given direction to them also to do it on the first day of the week: 'As I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye.' Whence we may learn, that it was nothing peculiar in the circumstances of the Christians at Corinth, which was the reason why the Holy Ghost insisted that they should perform this duty on this day of the week. The Apostle had given the like order to the churches of Galatia.

"Now Galatia was far distant from Corinth; the sea parted them; and besides that, there were several other countries between them. Therefore it cannot be thought that the Holy Ghost directs them to this time upon any secular account, having respect to some particular circumstances of the people in that city, but upon a religious account. In giving the preference to this day for such work, before any other day, he has respect to something which reached all Christians throughout the wide world.

"And by other passages of the New Testament we learn that the case was the same as to other exercises of religion; and that, in the age of the apostles, the first day of the week was preferred before any other day among the primitive Christians, and in churches immediately under the care of the apostles, for an attendance on the exercises of religion in general. Acts xx. 7, 'Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them.' It seems by these things to have been among the primitive Christians in the apostles' days,

with respect to the first day of the week, as it was among the Jews with respect to the seventh.

"We are taught by Christ that the doing of alms and showing of mercy are proper works for the Sabbath-day. When the Pharisees found fault with Christ for suffering his disciples to pluck the ears of corn and eat on the Sabbath, Christ corrects them with that, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice,' Matt. xii. 7. And Christ teaches that works of mercy are proper to be done on the Sabbath, in Luke xiii. 15, 16; xiv. 5. These works used to be done on sacred festivals and days of rejoicing under the Old Testament, as in Nehemiah's and Esther's time, Neh. viii. 10; and Esth. ix. 19, 22. And Josephus and Philo, two very noted Jews, who wrote not long after Christ's time, give an account that it was the manner among the Jews on the Sabbath to make collections for sacred and pious uses."

In this clear statement there are several propositions and conclusions which do not command the universal assent of writers about the Sabbath.

Without stopping to discuss whether Paul, when he wrote the directions in question, was guided by the Holy Ghost or by his own natural wisdom,—but assuming that, on either supposition, the course enjoined by him was chosen because of its suitableness to the end in view,—we may at once proceed to inquire what it was that might render the first day of the week a convenient time for the laying up in store, by the Christians in Galatia and Corinth, of contributions for the relief of their brethren at Jerusalem. The reply of Edwards and his fellow-Puritans to the question is, that Sunday was now the Sabbath; that the Christians everywhere met on it statedly for worship; and that, as the Jews at *their* Sabbath-meetings used to make collections for sacred and pious purposes, so it was a habit of the Christians to contribute alms when assembled on the Christian Sabbath.

The fact, however (of which this eminent divine appears to have been ignorant), that the Jewish Christians continued after their conversion to observe the seventh-day Sabbath as before, and to hold on it their customary assemblies in the synagogues; and the still more important fact, that not a single meeting on the first day of the week is mentioned by St Paul in his epistles or recorded speeches,—present undeniably a very serious obstacle to the reception of this theory. There is not in them even an *allusion* to any such meetings, or to a custom of holding them; for although the putting of contributions into the treasury of the church, by persons there assembled, is thought by many interpreters to be implied in the act of "every one laying by him in store," *in order that "there might be no gatherings"* (λογίαι) *when the Apostle should come,** this

* The words in the original are, "Ἕκαστος ὑμῶν παρ' ἑαυτῷ τιθέτω, θησαυρίζων ὅ τι ἂν εὐοδῶται; which the Vulgate correctly renders, "Unusquisque vestrum *apud se seponat*, recondens quod," &c. Le Clerc's transla-

opinion is irreconcileable with the plain terms of the injunction, and has no other ground than the fancy that, unless the money were put by all into a common treasury, there *must* have been gatherings at the coming of Paul. In fact, however, there is neither necessity nor any strong reason for so interpreting λογίαι; a word which, as Vitringa remarks, being found nowhere else in Scripture, is of doubtful meaning, but if it signify "gatherings" may with perfect propriety be understood to import such gatherings as should be formed by those weekly additions to private hoards which the Apostle expressly recommends.* His use of the word λογίαι in the plural (in both verses) confirms this view; which is supported also by the decided opinion of Neander, that θησαυρίζειν "contradicts the notion of a public collection;" which, says he, is "a gratuitous supposition, not at all required by the connection of the passage." (*History of the Planting of the Christian Church*, i. 158; in Bohn's Standard Library). Milton expresses himself to the same effect (see above, p. 53); as does likewise Olshausen, in his *Commentary on Corinthians*, p. 266 (Edin. 1851). And not only does Chrysostom, writing in the fourth century, understand Paul to mean the laying up of alms *at home*, but he is so far from imagining the possibility of any other intention, that (as we saw above, i. 138) he is careful to explain why, in his opinion, the Apostle preferred the hoarding in private to the bringing in of contributions to assemblies of the church.

The question, Whether the passage implies the observance, at the date of Paul's epistle (A.D. 56), of the first day of the week, either as the Sabbath, or (according to Beza, Baxter, Limborch, Paley, and others) as a new and independent religious festival in commemoration of Christ's resurrection, is critically considered by Sir William Domville in his first volume on *The Sabbath*, pp. 101–115, 162. His conclusion, after a most careful and impartial examination, is, that it furnishes absolutely no ground for either of these opinions; on the contrary, in the apostle's omission to designate this day "the Lord's," and to enforce his appeal to the liberality of the Corinthian converts by such a stirring reference to their

tion is, "Que chacun les (aumônes) *mette à part chez soi*, et les amasse selon qu'il fait bien ses affaires."

* "Non puto id jacere in verbis Pauli, quod pecunia illa, ingratiam pauperum seponenda vel separanda die illo hebdomadæ primo, eadem illa die in Ecclesiâ fidelium collecta sit. In verbis Pauli nihil reperias, nisi de pecuniâ seponendâ, nec autumem Paulum quid aliud intendisse. Loquitur Paulus de pecunia apud privatos seponenda et in thezaurum aliquem congreganda; non de collectione instituenda in Ecclesia. Vocabulum equidem λογίαι ordinariò in hunc sensum flectitur, acsi notaret *collectas* in Ecclesia instituendas; verum illius obscura est significatio, quia hoc tantum in contextu (bis quidem), nec alibi in Scriptura, reperitur. Si id per *collectam* vertendum sit, quod urget Beza, tum notabit hoc loco ipsam illam *collectionem pecuniæ*, quam privati instituebant, quando quaque hebdomada nummorum aliquam summam summæ addebant, atque ita quandam quasi συλλογὴν *nummorum* (*thezaurum* sive *cumulum*, secundum Paulum) faciebant." (*De Synag. Vet.*, lib. 3, pars 1, cap. 13, p. 813.)

obligations to the risen Saviour as would have been natural had Sunday been religiously observed at the time, Sir William finds weighty grounds for believing that the custom of thus observing it had no existence among them.* And in Paul's anxious uncertainty afterwards (2 Cor. viii.) as to the amount which they were actually laying aside in compliance with his injunction, Sir William sees a new indication of the fact that the gatherings were private; since, had the sums laid by in store been put weekly into the public treasury, the apostle might at once have allayed his anxiety by procuring information on the subject from the officers of the church.

What, then, it will be asked, could be the apostle's reason for naming the first day of the week to these Corinthian disciples? "A probable conjecture," says the writer just quoted, "is all the answer that can be given to such a question. Intending to recommend periodical savings, St Paul, we may readily believe, would feel certain they would never be regularly made unless he named some particular day; and what day could be more conveniently chosen than the first day of each week?" (P. 111.) Milton's conjecture is, that Paul might be led to select it, "from the idea that our alms ought to be set aside as a kind of first-fruits to God, previous to satisfying other demands; or because the first day of the week was most convenient for the arrangement of the family accounts." (See above, p. 53.) By Grotius, Cocceius, and Vitringa, again, it is suggested that since the Christian converts from Judaism, retaining a Jewish custom, did not handle money on the Sabbath, the ensuing day would seem to the apostle fitter for this purpose. (Above, i. 223; Cocceii *Op.* tom. vii., ad Quæst. 83; Vitringa, *De Synag. Vet.*, p. 812.) That the Jews considered unlawful the handling of money on the Sabbath, is mentioned also by Buxtorf (*Synag. Jud.*, cap. 16, p. 361; cap. 44, p. 662). But the antiquity of this belief, at least in regard to cases where the sums were small, seems to be disproved by Matt. vi. 2—"When thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men." In a passage quoted from Philo by Vitringa, however, the prevalence among the Jews at Rome in our Saviour's time of an aversion to handle money on the Sabbath appears to be intimated; for he praises the Emperor Augustus because, in his anxiety that they should partake of his bounty, he ordered that if the monthly day of distribution of money and corn "fell on the day of their sacred Sabbath, on which day it is not lawful for them to receive

* Nay, says he, "in looking to the speeches of St Paul, recorded in the book of the Acts, and to his own voluminous writings, we find this text from the Epistle to the Corinthians to be the only instance of his making mention [even] of '*the first day of the week*;' and in this one instance we cannot but be sensible with what cold indifference he names a day which it is now pretended was, in the estimation of the Corinthians, and in his own, a day of the week set apart from the rest for the performance of solemn offices of religion in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ!" (P. 113.)

anything, or to give anything, or, in short, to perform any of the ordinary duties of life," the distribution should be made to them on the following day. (Philo *On the Virtues and Office of Ambassadors*, § 33; in his *Works*, translated by Yonge, iv. 135.) Hence it has been concluded that on the Sabbath evening each member of the synagogue merely *promised* so much, which was paid when the day had expired. Vitringa states that sometimes, after the usual collection, an extraordinary one was made by the *chazzan* (deacons) for some particular purpose; and he quotes Leo of Modena to the effect that, "as this was usually done on the Sabbath-day (when the Jews do not handle money), each person, by word of mouth, bound himself to the ministers of the synagogue for a certain sum, which he paid the following week." (Leo de Modena, *Rit. Jud.*, pars i., cap. 14.)

If it was because money could not be laid by on the seventh day by the Christian Jews and proselytes (who continued to observe it as the Sabbath), that Paul recommended another day to the Corinthians, it is easy to find a probable reason why the first in preference to any other might be fixed on. As the Sabbath ended at sunset, the interval between its close and the time for going to sleep was so short, that few, if any, would be inclined to resume their ordinary business. Here, then, was a season of leisure, sufficient for the ascertainment by each of the sum he could afford, and for adding it to the store which Paul should receive at his coming; and as this class of Christians abounded also in the churches of Galatia, it was natural that he should give the like direction to them. So that, even though Galatia and Corinth had several other countries and the sea between them, we are nowise compelled to join President Edwards, either in his sweeping general inference that the apostle "had respect to something which reached *all Christians throughout the wide world*," or, in his particular inference that this "something" was the observance of Sunday by all Christians as the Sabbath. Nay, it is possible that the uniformity of the injunctions arose, not from anything common to the Christians in Galatia and Corinth, but merely from the fact that one man was the enjoiner, and framed his precept in both cases according to his own perceptions of expediency.

In the passage under review, President Edwards insists strongly on the circumstance that the giving of alms is a great duty of Christianity. But is it an act of *worship*, otherwise than as all Christian duties are? If not, how does a direction to lay by alms on the first day of the week tend to prove that the day was devoted to worship? His remark that "we are taught by Christ that the doing of alms and showing of mercy are proper works for the Sabbath-day," is untrue, if by "proper" be meant "peculiarly fit;" and it is pointless if he mean "allowable" or "lawful." The *lawfulness* of works of mercy on the Sabbath-day in spite of the letter of the commandment, is what our Lord so frequently asserted—we never find him teaching that such works are *fitter* for the Sabbath than for other days.

With respect to Acts xx. 7, which also is adduced by Edwards to prove that the first day of the week was regarded by the primitive Christians as a Sabbath, the reader is referred to Milton's reply to this argument, as quoted above, p. 53; and to Sir William Domville's work on the Sabbath, vol. i., pp. 71–101, 141, 160, 210. It is enough here to recal the fact that the correct translation is this: "And upon the first [day] of the week, the disciples being come together to break bread, Paul discoursed to them;" while, if we adopt the reading of Griesbach and the editors of all or most of the other recent critical editions of the New Testament, the words, "we being come together," must be substituted for "the disciples," &c. (See above, i. 85, note.) The question is, how far this meeting, the only one recorded in the New Testament to have been held on the first day of the week for worship (if indeed the breaking of bread was the celebration of the Lord's Supper), goes to prove that this day had been divinely appointed "to be especially set apart among Christians for religious exercises and duties."

"That this," says Edwards, "is the doctrine which the Holy Ghost intended to teach us by this and some other passages of the New Testament, I hope will appear plainly by the sequel. This is a doctrine that we have been generally brought up in by the instructions and examples of our ancestors; and it is and has been the general profession of the Christian world, that this day ought to be religiously observed and distinguished from other days of the week. However, some deny it. Some refuse to take any notice of the day, or any way to difference it from other days. Others own that it is a laudable custom of the Christian church, into which she fell by agreement, and by appointment of her ordinary rulers, to set apart this day for public worship; but they deny any other original to such an observation of the day than prudential human appointment. Others religiously observe the Jewish Sabbath, suppose that the institution of that is of perpetual obligation, and that we want foundation for determining that that is abrogated, and another day of the week is appointed in the room of the seventh.

"All these classes of men say that there is no clear revelation that it is the mind and will of God, that the first day of the week should be observed as a day to be set apart for religious exercises, in the room of the ancient Sabbath, which there ought to be, in order to the observation of it by the Christian church, as a divine institution. They say, that we ought not to go upon the tradition of past ages, or upon uncertain and far-fetched inferences from some passages of the history of the New Testament, or upon some obscure and uncertain hints in the apostles' writings; but that we ought to expect a plain institution; which, they say, we may conclude God would have given us, if he had designed that the whole Christian church, in all ages, should observe another day of the week for an holy Sabbath, than that which was appointed of old by plain and positive institution.

"So far is undoubtedly true, that if this be the mind and will of God, he hath not left the matter to human tradition; but hath so revealed his mind about it, in his word, that there is there to be found good and substantial evidence that it is his mind; and, doubtless, the revelation is plain enough for them that have ears to hear; that is, for them that will justly exercise their understandings about what God says to them. No Christian, therefore, should rest till he has satisfactorily discovered the mind of God is in this matter. If the Christian Sabbath be of divine institution, it is doubtless of great importance to religion that it be well kept; and therefore that every Christian be well acquainted with the institution.

"If men only take it upon trust, and keep the first day of the week only because their parents taught them so, or because they see others do so, and so they take it for certain that it is right, they will never be likely to keep it so conscientiously and strictly as if they had seen it with their own eyes, and had been convinced by seeing for themselves good grounds in the word of God for their practice; and unless they do see thus for themselves, whenever they are negligent in sanctifying the Sabbath, or are guilty of profaning it, their consciences will not have that advantage to smite them for it as otherwise they would. And those who have a sincere desire to obey God in all things, will keep the Sabbath more carefully and more cheerfully, if they have seen and been convinced that therein they do what is according to the will and command of God, and what is acceptable to him; and will also have a great deal more comfort in the reflection upon their having carefully and painfully kept the Sabbath.

"Therefore, I design now, by the help of God, to show, that it is sufficiently revealed in the Scriptures, to be the mind and will of God, that the first day of the week should be distinguished in the Christian church from other days of the week, as a Sabbath, to be devoted to religious exercises.

"In order to this, I shall here premise, that the mind and will of God, concerning any duty to be performed by us, may be sufficiently revealed in his word, without a particular precept in so many express terms, enjoining it. The human understanding is the ear to which the word of God is spoken; and if it be so spoken that that ear may plainly hear it, it is enough. God is sovereign as to manner of speaking his mind, whether he will speak it in express terms, or whether he will speak it by saying several other things which imply it, and from which we may, by comparing them together, plainly perceive it. If the mind of God be but revealed, if there be but sufficient means for the communication of his mind to our minds, that is sufficient—whether we hear so many express words with our ears, or see them in writing with our eyes; or whether we see the thing that he would signify to us, by the eye of reason and understanding." (Pp. 179–182.)

To the soundness of these remarks no theological party will object. What men differ about is the *sufficiency* of everything in the New Testament to prove a Christian Sabbath.

Though experience shows that honest and intelligent students of Scripture may here take opposite sides, it is the unseemly habit of some disputants to assume, that while they themselves are candid, well-informed, and unprejudiced, their opponents are deplorably the reverse. According to the Scottish Sabbath Alliance, for example, all who say that the Sabbath was an exclusively Jewish institution (including such men as Jeremy Taylor, Milton, Baxter, Vitringa, Limborch, and Whately), thereby "clearly prove either their dishonesty, or ignorance, or inability to comprehend a very plain and simple subject." (See their *Tract* No. IV.) So also a writer of some note among the English dissenters says that whoever asks demonstration of the divine appointment of the Christian Sabbath "*is blinded by a moral cause* to those exquisite pencillings, to those unobtruded vestiges, which furnish their clearest testimony to this Institute, and which are the best grounds of all historic credence." (*Horæ et Vindiciæ Sabbaticæ*, by Dr Richard Winter Hamilton, p. 143). And a Scottish presbyterian minister, who quotes some of Edwards's remarks, is charitably "prepared to admit, in reference to this and many other duties, that it is quite a possible thing for *a mind that is desirous of evading the evidence regarding it* to succeed in doing so." (Dr A. Thomson, in *The Christian Sabbath considered in its Various Aspects*, p. 93.) But such writers ought to remember that the blindness of prejudice is a disease with which they themselves, as fallible mortals, may be affected; and that the eyes of those who see the "motes" in their neighbours' eyes, are not always free from darkening "beams." How else can we account for the self-complacency with which yet another Sabbatarian, though himself overlooking so important a passage as Rom. xiv. 5, 6, expresses himself as follows?—"Some may wish for more evidence that the Sabbath was changed by divine authority from the Jewish seventh to the Christian first day of the week; but the question is, taking *the whole circumstances of the case* into account, Is more needed, or to be reasonably expected? Is it not a principle of God's Word, in many cases to give enough, and no more—to satisfy the devout, *not overpower the uncandid*?"*

Sir William Domvile has examined more fully and carefully than any one else "the whole circumstances of the case," and he sums up the results as follows:—"I have replied," says he, "to this argument of the Sabbatarians, and met their evidence by counter-evidence; and it is my sincere conviction that I have thereby made it apparent, beyond all justifiable doubt, that the very reverse of the Sabbatarian tenet as to the observance of Sunday in the time of the Apostles is the historical truth; that, so far from the religious observance of the Sunday as a Christian festival having been universal in the Christian Church at that time, and so far from such alleged observance

* The propounder of these questions is Dr J. G. Lorimer of Glasgow, who has given his treatise the *very* candid title of *The Protestant or the Popish Sabbath?* The quotation is from his 31st page.

having had the sanction of the Apostles, there is not a single instance recorded in Scripture of the observance of the Sunday by the Christian Church, nor a single instance of such observance by the Apostles themselves, or by any one of them; and further, that there is no Scripture proof of any custom of the Apostles, or of the Church in their time, to observe that day; that, consequently, there are no just grounds for presuming that a precept from Christ, or his Apostles, enjoining such observance, did once exist, though not now extant; and finally, that the legitimate and undeniable conclusion from these well-established premises is this,—that the observance of the Sunday, whether as a Sabbath or as a stated day 'of assembly for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction,' is *not* an institution of *Divine* appointment." (Vol. i. p. 215.)

Nine years have elapsed since the publication of Sir William's most able, elaborate, and scholarlike treatise; but to this day it continues unanswered. Supposing his conclusions to be sound, how could the evidence which has thus impressed *him*, convey so different a belief to the authors of the Puritan scheme? The most probable answer seems to be this: The Puritans were clamorous opponents of the holidays of the Papal and Anglican Churches; but at the same time, they admitted and contended for the obligation to observe the Sabbath by virtue of the Fourth Commandment. To their denial of the authority of tradition as a warrant for Church-holidays and other rites, the Romanist opposed the *argumentum ad homines*,—"What better authority than tradition have *you* for keeping holy the first day of the week, in place of that seventh day which the Jews, including our Lord himself, observed in obedience to the law?" Here was a difficulty to be met; proof must be found in Scripture, of the change by divine authority. And what it was imperative to find, theologians easily discovered. Would it be wonderful if, in such circumstances, even honest interpreters saw more meaning in certain passages than is really there; if they were comparatively blind to the counter-indications which other passages afford; and if, when Sabbatarianism had at length been widely and firmly established, men brought up to that faith, and perhaps officially bound to defend it, should be no less subject than their opponents to the blinding influences which work so insidiously in us all?

Supposing, on the other hand, that Sir William Domville has wandered from the truth, is it not to be lamented that so skilful a reasoner has so long been allowed to remain unanswered?

248. CORNTHWAITE, ROBERT, *minister of the Mill Yard Seventh-Day Baptist Church, London.*—Reflections on Dr Wright's Treatise on the Religious Observation of the Lord's Day, according to the express words of the Fourth Commandment; showing the inconclusiveness of the Doctor's reasoning on that Subject, and the

impossibility of grounding the First Day Sabbath on the Fourth Commandment, or any other Text of Scripture produced by him for that purpose. Lond. (*circa* 1733).

Several other publications by Mr Cornthwaite followed this; (*see* Nos. 250, 252, 254, 260), of the last of which some account will be given below.

249. STACKHOUSE, THOMAS, *Vicar of Beenham, Berkshire* (*born* 1680; *died* 1752).—A Complete Body of Speculative and Practical Divinity, extracted from the Best Ancient and Modern Writers. Third Edition. Lond. 1755. Fol. (See Part iii. ch. 4.)

250. CORNTHWAITE, ROBERT (*see* No. 248).—The Seventh Day of the Week the Christian Sabbath. Lond. 1735. 8vo. Pp. 23.

251. FLEMING, CALEB, *a Unitarian minister in London* (*born* 1698; *died* 1779).—The Fourth Commandment abrogated by the Gospel: Or, the Fourth Commandment's enjoining the Observance of the Seventh Day of the Week as a Religious Rest was only obligatory and binding within the Jewish State; but the Law of the Sabbath being destroyed, the Christian Institution authorizeth the Christian's Observance of the First Day of the Week as an Holy Festival. Lond. 1736. 8vo. Pp. 68.

252. CORNTHWAITE, ROBERT (*see* Nos. 248, 250).—The Seventh-Day Sabbath farther Vindicated; or, a Defence of some Reflections on Dr Wright's Treatise on the Religious Observation of the Lord's Day, according to the express words of the Fourth Commandment; as also, of The Seventh Day of the Week the Christian Sabbath, against the Exceptions of Mr Caleb Fleming. Lond. 1736.

253. FLEMING, CALEB (*see* No. 251).—A Plain and

Rational Account of the Law of the Sabbath; being a Defence of a late Pamphlet, entitled, "The Fourth Commandment Abrogated by the Gospel;" or an Answer to Mr Robert Cornthwaite's further Defence of the Seventh Day Sabbath; in which Gen. ii. 2, 3, (called by him the original institution) is more particularly considered, and his most material Objections and Criticisms Refuted. In a Letter to Mr Cornthwaite. Lond. 1736. 8vo. Pp. 65.

254. CORNTHWAITE, ROBERT (*see* Nos. 248, 250, and 252).—A Second Defence of some Reflections on Dr Wright's Treatise on the Religious Observation of the Lord's Day, &c., against the exceptions of Mr Caleb Fleming; in which his Explication of Gen. ii. 2, 3, is considered, and shown to be as inconsistent as the Doctor's Explication of the Fourth Commandment; and the Seventh-Day Sabbath is proved to oblige all Christians on Protestant Principles. Lond. (*circa* 1737.)

255. CHUBB, THOMAS, *a Deistical writer* (*born* 1679; *died* 1747).—Dissertation concerning the Time for Keeping a Sabbath; appended to his Work entitled, "The Equity and Reasonableness of the Divine Conduct in Pardoning Sinners upon their Repentance exemplified." Lond. 1737. 8vo. Pp. 111.

256. WILKINS, DAVID, D.D., *Prebendary of Canterbury* (*died* 1745).—Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ, a Synodo Verolamiensi A.D. 446, ad Londinensem A.D. 1717. Accedunt Constitutiones et alia ad Historiam Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ spectantia. Lond. 1737. 4 vols. fol.

In this valuable collection many ecclesiastical laws about the observance of the Lord's-day will be found. Each volume has an Index. The Anglo-Saxon laws relating to this subject are included in the same editor's *Leges Anglo-Saxonicæ, Ecclesiasticæ et Civiles*; Lond. 1721, fol.

257. WATTS, ISAAC, D.D., *a celebrated Dissenting Min-*

ister in London (*born* 1674; *died* 1748).—The Holiness of Times, Places, and People under the Jewish and Christian Dispensations considered and compared, in several Discourses, viz.: 1. On the Perpetuity of a Sabbath, and the Observation of the Lord's Day. 2. The Administration of the Lord's Supper at Noon or Evening, &c. Lond. 1738. 12mo. Pp. 215. (Reprinted in his Works, vol. ii. pp. 501–575; Lond. 1810; 6 vols. 4to.)

In general, the Puritan opinions about the Sabbath are those advocated by Dr Watts. With regard to the Jewish Sabbath, he considers *bodily rest* to have been "*the prime end of the institution;*" "the most obvious original design of it." This, says he, "appears from the very name *Sabbath*, which is a Hebrew word, and signifies *rest;* it appears also from the frequent repetition of the law of the Sabbath peculiarly as a day of rest, both in the books of Moses and the writings of the prophets." He adds, however: "But the design of God herein was not that the Jews should wear away the day in lazy idleness; but since they rested and were released from common work, there were other sacred services appointed them; they were obliged to celebrate the worship of God; it was a day of holiness; 'Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy.'" (Pp. 17, 18.) On the latter point he quotes also Lev. xxiii. 3; Isa. lvi. 6; Acts xvi. 13; Ps. xcii.; Luke iv. 16, 31; Acts xiii. 21; xv. 21; Numb. xxviii. 9, 10. With respect to resting *on the Lord's Day*, on the other hand, he goes only so far as to maintain, that "if one day in seven be appointed in the New Testament for Christian assemblies and religious worship, *it is most highly expedient, if not necessary*, that it should be a day of rest from the common labours of this life." (P. 32.) Farther: "Though worship," says he, "be the chief design, yet I do not pretend that actual worship should fill up the whole day. . . . The Jewish sabbatizings being now abolished by many scriptures, and all their ceremonial holiness, I think the holiness of the Lord's Day cannot rise higher than that of the Paradisaical Sabbath before the Jewish ceremonies and holy things were introduced; for we have no such new order given us in the New Testament. If, therefore, we do but so far rest from the common businesses of life as the due seasons of Christian worship require, in order to render that worship most useful to the public honour of our blessed Lord, and to our own inward holiness and growth in grace, the chief designs of this day are complied with and obtained." (Pp. 47, 64.)

With admirable modesty he thus concludes: "Since all Jewish festivals, New Moons, and Sabbaths, are abolished by St Paul's authority, in such express and unlimited language as may lead many sincere Christians to believe that all manner of distinction of days whatsoever, whether Jewish or Patriarchal, is finished; since the

religious observation of days, in the 14th chapter to the Romans, in general, is represented as a matter of doubtful disputation; since the observation of the Lord's Day is not built upon any express and plain institution by Christ or his Apostles in the New Testament, but rather on examples, and probable inferences, and on the reasons and relations of things; I can never pronounce any thing hard or severe upon any fellow-Christian who maintains real piety in heart and life, though his opinion may be very different from mine on this subject. Nor does any man, who is humbly and sincerely studious of truth and duty, and desirous to find it, deserve any reproach or censure upon the account of different opinions about meats and days; unless he assume such haughty airs of assurance as arise far beyond all his evidence and proof, or indulge a persecuting spirit, and reproach his brethren who differ from him." (Pp. 69, 70.)

There are two Appendixes to this Discourse. The first is a collection of "Testimonies of the Primitive Fathers to the Lord's Day," extracted from the second part of Lord King's *Enquiry into the Primitive Churches* (No. 221). The passage from Ignatius which is quoted above, i. 119, is translated by Watts alternatively thus: "Let us no longer sabbatize, but keep the Lord's Day (*or live according to the Lord's life*), on which day our life arose by him."* Another passage, also quoted above, i. 120, and which continues to be adduced by many writers as genuine, he correctly describes as interpolated.

His second appendix is a statement of the effect produced upon his mind by a review of the controversy. He says: "Since this Discourse was written in the year 1733, I have resumed this controversy about the Sabbath into an impartial examination, and have read all the papers since written, which have come within my notice. I confess some of them contain several thoughts of great importance on this subject; but I do not find upon the whole review any sufficient reason to change my scheme or sentiments, though I hope I have been enabled to confirm and establish some parts of them, by relieving objections which I had not met with before, and inserting here and there a further illustration.

"If the scheme which I have proposed be deficient in any part of it, so far as I can judge, it must be in these three particulars.

"1. In the proof the Patriarchal Sabbath to be moral and perpetual.

"2. In securing the appointment of the Patriarchal Sabbath from that general abolition of all manner of Sabbaths, and all distinction of days, which St Paul seems to pronounce in Rom. xiv., Gal. iv., and Col. ii.

"3. In proving the Lord's-day to be an actual solemn institution, or command of Christ and his Apostles.

"Now, if the proofs of these things should appear to be insuffi-

* He ought to have given as the alternative translation of the last clause (in which the word "day" is interpolated), the version of Archbishop Wake, viz.—"in which also our life is sprung up."

cient and defective, and if I were thereby constrained to change the present scheme,—upon my closest survey of things, I think I should do it in this manner.

"I would allow the institution of the Patriarchal Sabbath to be a mere positive command to the patriarchs, and re-inforced by Moses to the Jewish nation, even as sacrifices were, or as circumcision, which were both abolished by Christianity.

"And though the law of the Sabbath might have many rational expediencies in it which look like moral duties, yet perhaps it is possible they may not quite arise to an express moral command, and a law of perpetual obligation. So the *Talion Law* of punishment for injuries received amongst the Jews, viz. 'an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,' has great appearances in it of rational expediency, and of a moral nature; yet it is not supposed to be made a moral and perpetual law, but, together with all other peculiar laws of the Jews, it was abrogated when the Jewish Church and State were dissolved.

"2. I might then allow the utter abolition of the Patriarchal, as well as the Jewish Sabbath, by the strong and unlimited expressions of St Paul, concerning the abolition of all distinctions of meats, and days, and Sabbaths; even as sacrifices were begun with Adam, and circumcision with Abraham, yet both were finished at the introduction of Christianity.

"3. But then, in the third place, it will appear there is so much expediency, and almost a necessity of solemn and certain days appointed for the preservation of all public religion, and for the celebration of Christian worship, that the Apostles thought it necessary, by their recommendation, and by their own example, to devote or set apart one day in seven for this purpose; since God, under all his former dispensations, had sanctified and appointed one day in seven for his public worship. And as the *Talion Law*, and some other parts of Jewish polity, seem to be grounded upon a very reasonable expediency, and may be a proper direction and advice to every state in their making of laws, so the reasonableness and expediency of appointing one day in seven for public worship, appearing evident to the Apostles from all God's former dispensations, and almost from the nature of things, they gave it as their advice to the Christian Churches to follow this custom, and practised it themselves.

"And since all the former distinctions of days, and their holiness were abolished, and even the observation of the seventh day, whereon God finished his creation, and since there must be some day agreed upon for public worship, they thought it very proper, that since the great work of the redemption of Christ (which lays a foundation for the new creation) was finished on the first day of the week by Christ's resurrection from the dead, that this day should succeed in the place of the day appointed as a memorial of the old creation; and in order to keep both these important matters always within the view of Christians, viz. both creation and redemption, therefore one day in seven, and particularly the first of the

seven, was recommended by the Apostles to be their constant day of public worship. And thus the observation of the Lord's Day, of which we have not a plain and uncontested proof by way of Divine solemn institution in the New Testament, will stand upon the foot of a most reasonable practice, partly borrowed from the institutions of God in all former ages, ever since the creation, and partly from the apostolical advice, recommendation, and example, in the last age of the Church.

"And if this should appear to be the case, then the only reason which I can think of, why so expedient and almost necessary a practice was not made an express and solemn institution, and why it was left rather upon the foot of Apostolic advice and example, was, that the consciences of good Christians, especially while the world was all Jewish or heathen, might have some liberty indulged them, and might not be laid under so severe a yoke of bondage, as sometimes such an express institution might happen to lay upon them in Jewish or heathen countries. This reason I have mentioned in the Discourse itself, as one way of accounting for the obscurity and doubtfulness of such an institution, if the Lord's Day was really instituted.

"I say again, if I were to change my present sentiments, so far as I can yet judge, I should fall into these which I have now expressed; but I acknowledge I have not yet seen sufficient reason to depart from the sentiments I have maintained in the Discourse itself, nor to relinquish our obligations to observe one day in seven for a day of rest and worship as a perpetual law, and particularly the Lord's Day, as an appointment of Christ by his Apostles. 'We know but in part,' and we should not be too positive beyond all our evidence. 'Whereto we have attained, let us walk by the same rule, and mind the same thing;' and let us be followers of St Paul and the other Apostles, 'and mark' or imitate them 'that walk so as we have them for our example,' Phil. iii. 16, 17. What appears a sufficient evidence to one man does not appear so to another; 'Let us all follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord,' Heb. xii. 14. 'For the kingdom of heaven is not meats, and drinks, and days, but righteousness and peace,' Rom. xiv. (Pp. 77–82.)

258. KILLINGWORTH, GRANTHAM.—A Supplement to the Sermons at Salter's Hall against Popery, in which Infant-Sprinkling is shown to be another great Corruption. Fifth Edition, with an Appendix concerning the First Day of the Week. Lond. 1738. 8vo. Pp. 111.

259. JEPHSON, ALEXANDER, *Rector of Craike, in the Diocese of Durham.*—A Discourse concerning the Religious Observation of the Lord's Day, both doctrinal

and practical. In two parts. Under the following heads, viz.,—I. The Grounds and Reasons of the Observation of the Sabbath and Lord's Day; II. An Account of the Change of the Day from the Seventh to the First Day of the Week; III. The Benefits and Advantages, both to the Public and to private Persons, from the devout and religious Observation of the Lord's Day; IV. The particular manner in which this Holy Day ought to be observed by all Christians. 2d ed. Lond. 1738. 8vo. Pp. 432.

This book was issued in 1740 with a new title: "The Christian Sabbath explained; with Rules for a Religious Observation of the Lord's Day, both doctrinal and practical. In two parts," &c.

It is a copious exposition of the Sabbath doctrine which then was, and seems still to be, most in favour with the clergy of the English Church, and of which a summary is above quoted from Archbishop Sharp (see p. 141). Mr Jephson shows an extensive acquaintance with the chief Episcopalian treatises in the controversy, and makes many quotations from them, as well as from ancient heathen and Christian writers. The reason he assigns for adding another to the long series of books is, that "the horrible profanation of this holy season is now grown so general and common that no one can possibly be insensible of it; . . . and indeed, in so shameful a manner is this holy day now profaned by great numbers of all orders and degrees of men among us, not only by the neglect of attending upon the public worship, but also by spending the whole day in travelling, in keeping of company, and in worldly business and pleasure; that unless some speedy stop be put thereto by those who are in authority, the Christian religion will be in great danger of being lost in this kingdom; and the greatest part of our youth will be corrupted in their principles and debauched in their morals beyond all recovery, to the infinite mischief and damage of the whole nation." (*Pref.*)

In what he says concerning the Fourth Commandment we find the same inconsistency which was noticed in Archbishop Sharp (above, p. 144). In one page he teaches, in unqualified terms, that "*we are not bound* to the observation of the Sabbath by virtue of the law which God gave to the Israelites by Moses; for this is a matter of a Jewish consideration, and as such wholly related to that people, and consequently upon the ceasing of that law it did of itself expire with it. Thus St Paul hath determined the case, Col. ii. 16." (P. 70.) But in the very next page and sentence he proceeds to affirm, that "so far as the Sabbath is of a moral consideration so far does the command which God gave to the Jews *lay an obligation upon us*;" in other words, we *are* bound thus far by that law to the observation of the Sabbath. What he really means to

say is, that in Exod. xx. 11, corresponding with Gen. ii. 3, we have *evidence* that God from the first required the observation of the Sabbath by all men, in remembrance of the creation; and that by this *primeval requirement* we are bound: besides that "our blessed Saviour hath likewise commanded us to keep it in the law of his gospel." (P. 71.) But this, if true, will by no means justify the assertion that the Jewish commandment lays an obligation upon us—which assertion Mr Jephson perhaps felt himself bound to make, because it is the practice of his Church to pray for help to keep that precept. Again, he assumes, as Dr Sharp also does, that Jesus gave his *Gentile* followers the command to keep the Sabbath, "by adopting the Ten Commandments into the moral law of his gospel, and making no exception to that of the Fourth." (P. 27.) He forgets, however, that our Lord addressed only those who were subject to the Mosaic law, and that if every precept which he, a Jew, gave to his countrymen be a part of "his gospel" for all mankind, Christians are bound by many other Jewish laws beside the Ten Commandments. Had Mr Jephson remembered the words of Paul in Rom. xiv. 4, 5, and Gal. iv. 9–11, he might have been led to doubt whether the gospel preached by the apostles to the Gentiles was co-extensive with what Jesus had spoken to the Jews. But, strange to say, from the beginning to the end of his ample treatise neither of these important passages is once quoted or referred to!

He differs from Heylin as to the sense in which the above-mentioned prayer for help to keep the Fourth Commandment was meant by the authors of the Liturgy to be understood. "Since the law of the Sabbath," says he, "was given by God at the creation of the world, and the law delivered in Exod. xx. is only a renewal and confirmation of the former; and further, since, as I before proved, any public day of rest which is dedicated to God's worship may as properly be called a Sabbath as the seventh day of the week which the Jews observed; it very clearly follows from hence that the Church might require all her members to celebrate one day in every week in memory of the creation according to God's commandment, by rehearsing to them the fourth precept of the law, in which that commandment is contained, without laying them under any obligation to keep the particular day of the Jewish Sabbath, which depended upon such reasons as were peculiar to the Jews, and was discovered to them by a remarkable dispensation of Providence, of which more hereafter. It is therefore very clear and certain, that the Church, by the recital of the Fourth Commandment and the petition which is subjoined, did not mean that we should beg of God to incline our hearts to keep the law of the Sabbath-day, so far only as it contained the law of nature and had been entertained in the Christian Church [which is Dr Heylin's interpretation]; and much less to declare, as Dr Heylin further supposes, that certain holy days established by her authority should be duly observed; since that man must be very sagacious indeed who can, in the fourth precept of the Decalogue, discover a command to

celebrate the festival of St Peter or St Paul, or any other of the apostles; and, as a learned writer well remarks, 'Nobody could ever show how this jumble of certain holy days (without regard to the Christian Sabbath more than to any other) is countenanced by the Fourth Commandment' (Hill *On the Fourth Commandment*, p. 6); but that one day in every week should be set apart for God's public worship and service, and that by virtue of a divine law.* And since, as Dr Heylin and others rightly judge, it is absurd to suppose that this should be the Jewish Sabbath, it must then be the keeping of one day in seven in memory of the creation, which God first required in Gen. ii. and afterwards renewed in Exod. xx., as was before shown. And that this is the true sense and judgment of our Church in this matter, seems to me very evident from the doctrine of our Church upon this point in the first part of the Homily concerning the place and time of prayer." (Pp. 42, 43.) The peculiar reason which he gives why the Jews were commanded to keep the *particular day* of their Sabbath is the one assigned by Mede (above, i. 155); namely, their deliverance on that day from Egyptian bondage (Deut. v. 15). The objection to thus founding on both copies of the Fourth Commandment need not be here repeated. (See above, i. 156; ii. 105, 157.) Mr Jephson adds, that what directed the Israelites to the particular day which they were obliged to keep, is to be found in Exod. xvi. 26, 27, where mention is made of the ceasing of the manna to drop on that day. (Pp. 71, 72.)

Having decided for the necessity and obligation of observing the Lord's-day, he proceeds to show that we must keep it *holy*. "And one would think," says he, "there should be no necessity of insisting upon this, it being a thing so plain and evident in itself. But yet there have not been wanting some men who have opposed it, and declared against the necessity of divine worship and service on this day, and who affirm that the peculiar sanctification of the Sabbath did consist in *resting* upon that day, and in the separation of it from all bodily work and labour; though they are indeed willing to own, that God in the enjoining that rest might have a farther view and regard to the actions of piety and religion; but they deny that they are comprehended in the notion of sanctifying the Sabbath, or that God hath thereby formally required and commanded them. And it is much to be feared that too many Christians have entertained the same thoughts concerning the Lord's-day, as may appear from their gross neglect of the religious duties of the day both public and private, and their dedicating it entirely to company, and drinking, and worldly pleasure. But now, if this were all, it would have been sufficient to have required the observation of the Sabbath-day without the injunction of keeping it *holy*, for *that* does of itself signify that it is a day of rest, whereas the additional command to keep it holy does plainly require something

* Mr Jephson evades the difficulty; which lies in the expression, "help us to keep," not *a* divine law, but "*this* law."

more. And I believe it will be difficult to show any place of Scripture where any day or time is said to be holy in such a sense. The keeping of a day holy does not only imply the separation of it from all bodily work and labour, but also the dedication of it to the worship and service of God, as is very evident from the constant sense of that expression in the sacred writings." (Pp. 56, 57.) Considering that several eminent Hebrew scholars had advocated the opinion here opposed by Mr Jephson, he might have been expected to adduce and examine the chief passages where the expression occurs in Scripture, and on which so much stress is laid by Spencer and others as showing that the ancient Jewish idea of keeping a day holy was different from that of most modern Christians, however "plain and evident" to those Christians *their own* meaning of "keeping holy" may be. To form a judgment on this point it is necessary to consult *all* the passages which bear upon it, and which are referred to in our Table of Questions and Texts (vol. i., p. 110). One of these, Neh. viii. 9–12, is thought by some to be *of itself* adequate to refute the popular supposition that the ancient Hebrews understood as we do what it was to keep a day holy. * (See above, *i.* 115; *ii.* 78, 107, 112, 163.) The dispute, it will be remembered, is not as to the utility and propriety of the custom of the later Jews to meet in synagogues on the Sabbath-day for prayer and instruction, but whether any duty but that of resting from labour *was enjoined them in the Fourth Commandment.* If Calvin's statement be true, that "if any one wishes to render *sanctify* by one word, it will be *to separate*" (*Comm. on Ezek.* xx. 12), we must learn from other sources than the word itself the *purpose* of the separation. It is plain, moreover, that Mr Jephson has no ground for his statement that the Fourth Commandment enjoins the *observance* of the Sabbath in addition to the *keeping of it holy.* The *remembering,* and not the *observing,* is what the precept speaks of.

He adopts the now generally abandoned opinion that synagogue-worship was established by Moses (p. 57); besides treating as a fact the fancy that all ancient nations divided their time into weeks, and kept the seventh day holy. (Pp. 18–23.) Of the origin of the week he can find no satisfactory explanation but the primeval institution of the Sabbath.

The silence of Jesus in regard to all but a very few of the externals of public worship is thus accounted for: "The Christian religion being of a most divine and spiritual nature does therefore require but few external ordinances and institutions, which may very well be left to the wisdom and prudence of ecclesiastical authority. But though our blessed Saviour hath not been so punctual and exact in the externals of divine worship for the reason above mentioned, yet he hath taken sufficient care for the worship itself, not only by communicating himself with the Jewish church, and submitting to the external ordinances of religion, which shall be considered hereafter; but also by requiring men to 'worship God in spirit and in truth' (John iv. 24), and to this end 'not to

forsake the assembling themselves together' (Heb. x. 25); by promising that 'where two or three are gathered together in his name there will he be in the midst of them' (Matt. xviii. 20); by instituting the two sacraments which are of public observation (Matt. xxviii. 19; Luke xxii. 19, 20); and by appointing an order of men whose peculiar office it should be to perform the service of God, and to preach his word in the assemblies of Christians (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; Luke x.; 2 Tim. ii. 2). And we may farther observe that our blessed Lord hath united all the members of his church into one body, and under one Spirit (Eph. iv. 4). Which unity cannot be upheld and maintained by an agreement only in the same doctrines, and by love and charity for one another, as some have imagined; but it also requires the assembling of themselves together for public worship, as is evident not only from the express doctrine of Scripture, which I have observed already, but also from the example and practice of the primitive believers, who, as St Luke tells us, 'continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and likewise in breaking of bread and in prayers.' (Acts ii. 42.) This is a sufficient provision for the public service of God; and therefore if it could not be proved that God hath appointed a particular day for his public worship, as some men say he hath not made any such appointment to Christians in the Holy Scripture (though, I humbly conceive the contrary hath in the foregoing part of this discourse been proved very clearly), yet that would be no objection at all to the necessity of such worship; for the institution of the worship does of itself sufficiently intimate that there must be some time and place appointed for it, and some manner of its celebration, either settled by God or left to the determination of authority; since, as Mr Calvin well remarks, 'unless the assemblies of the Church are fixed, and have their proper appointed days, they cannot be held and attended upon.' (*Instit.* lib. ii., cap. viii., § 32.) And it is certain that in this case, as well as others, whatsoever is determined by just and lawful authority is as necessarily to be complied with as the express institutions of God himself. The reason of which is not that any authority can possibly be equal to that of God, but because, to speak properly, all just authority, whether it be ecclesiastical or civil, is the authority of God himself; it being as plainly declared by God in Scripture that men should 'obey them that have the rule over them,' as that they should observe his own commands. (Rom. xiii. 1, 2; 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14; Heb. xiii. 17.) And what claims soever men may make to liberty and freedom, yet if they do not submit themselves to such commands of their superiors as are in no wise contrary to God's word, they do not, I am sure, observe the rules of Holy Scripture, and therefore cannot be accounted good Christians." (Pp. 108-111.)

How far Mr Jephson thinks recreations allowable on the Lord's Day will appear from the following passage:—"When men have observed the Lord's Day religiously, by a due and regular attendance upon the offices of the Church, and by discharging the

private exercises of religion, they may reasonably apply to themselves those words of our Saviour concerning the Christian Sabbath, which were spoken by him concerning the Jewish, viz., 'the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath' (Mark ii. 27). And particularly what an excellent prelate remarks with regard to the generality of mankind is very just and pertinent, viz., 'That they, who on all other days are confined to hard labour, or are otherwise obliged to a close attendance on their worldly affairs, must be allowed in some measure to consider this as a day of ease and relaxation from thought and labour, as well as a day of devotion, provided it be in a way that is innocent and inoffensive, and that the public offices of religion be duly attended, and the duties of a more private nature be not neglected.' (Bishop-Gibson's first *Pastoral Letter*, p. 46.) And what his Lordship here observes of the Christian Sabbath was formerly applied by the best Pagan writers to the heathen festivals; *i.e.*, they thought they were not only instituted and appointed for the honour and worship of their gods, but also for the ease and comfort, the refreshment and delight of mankind. (Plato *De Legib.* lib. ii.; Seneca *De Tranquil. Animi*, cap. xv.*) And therefore, if men will be careful and diligent in the religious observation of the Lord's Day, both with respect to the public and private duties of it, they are at full liberty to spend the remainder of this day as they think fit, either by walking in their gardens or the fields, or by conversing with their friends, or in any other way which is most pleasing and agreeable to them; provided they be careful not to abuse their liberty by turning it into licentiousness, and that they do not indulge themselves in such pleasures, nor partake of such diversions, as are inconsistent with the dignity of the season, the piety and gravity of good Christians, and afford just matter of offence and scandal to good men." (Pp. 391–2.)

In his chapter concerning the duty of reading the Holy Scriptures, Mr Jephson has some excellent remarks on the necessity of purging our minds of prejudice and partiality, with a view to interpreting them aright. (See pp. 149–156.) He deservedly censures that numerous class who "lay great stress and weight upon all such passages as make for them, and pass over those very slightly that make against them; and in case that any books are published in the controversy to explain the sense of Scripture, are sure to read only those which are on their own side; by which," says he, "it is very evident that they do not read in order to form a true judgment upon the point in debate, but only to confirm themselves more stedfastly in those opinions which they have already received." (P. 149.) He blames, above all, those knowing theological disputants who, while pretending to edify the people, and to confirm them in the true and sound profession of the Christian faith, "yet are guilty of a most shameful suppression of the truth of Scripture, in order to obstruct a right judgment upon the points

* See the passages referred to, above, p. 65.

in controversy." (P. 150.) In this respect he thinks that the Church of Rome has pre-eminently and abominably gone astray; but the fault, he allows, is "one which perhaps the writers of all parties may be in some measure guilty of." I do not accuse him of any such wilful and dishonest suppression in his own performance; but surely one who could so justly and freely censure others, ought to have been doubly careful not to bring himself within the range of his own condemnation by ignoring the important passages above referred to, on which so "great stress and weight" had always been laid by the opponents of his Sabbatarian views.

260. CORNTHWAITE, ROBERT (*see* No. 248).—An Essay on the Sabbath; or, a modest attempt towards a plain, scriptural resolution of the following questions:—I. Whether the Seventh-day Sabbath was given to Adam in Paradise? II. Whether the same now obliges Christians? Occasioned by the following pieces lately wrote upon the subject,—viz., Mr Hallett's Discourse on the Lord's Day; Mr Jephson's Discourse concerning the Religious Observation of the Lord's Day,&c.; Mr Chubb's Dissertation concerning the Time of Keeping a Sabbath; Mr Killingworth's Appendix to his Supplement to the Sermons preached at Salter's Hall against Popery; Mr Dobel's Seventh-Day Sabbath not obligatory on Christians, and his Appendix; and Dr Watts' Holiness of Times, Places, and People. In which everything judged material, offered by any of these gentlemen on the negative side of either of the above mentioned questions, is impartially considered. Lond. 1740. 8vo. Pp. 119.

Mr Cornthwaite is one of the ablest defenders of the positions taken up by the Seventh-Day Baptists: the chief of which are,—that the observance of the seventh day of the week was commanded in Paradise to Adam and all his posterity; that this precept was renewed to all men at Sinai; that Christ and his apostles, so far from having indicated any design to change the Sabbath-day to the first of the week, gave many intimations, by word and example, that the seventh day should be kept holy by their followers; and that, even had they omitted to do so, the reasons for which its observance was enjoined in Paradise and at Sinai would render the duty as incumbent on all men as on the patriarchs and Jews. For "it is as true to us," says Mr Cornthwaite, "that God rested the seventh day and blessed and sanctified it for a Sabbath, as it was to any before us. We want the same rest and refreshment as they did, and the commemoration of the works of creation is perhaps

more reasonable and necessary, at least not less so, at this distance of time from the creation than in the early ages of the world; so that there seems to be no foundation in reason for any formal renewal of the command of the Sabbath under the Christian dispensation." (P. 81.)

He observes: "Had either the abrogation or change of the Sabbath from the seventh to some other day of the week, been designed by God to take place under the Christian dispensation, as they would have been considerable innovations, and consequently have met with great opposition from the Jews, they would undoubtedly have been frequently inculcated, and the reasons of such abrogation or change plainly assigned, not only by Christ, but also by his apostles, and all the first publishers of the Christian religion. Whereas Christ and his apostles not only kept the seventh-day Sabbath, but also said never word, that we can find, either that it should be abrogated or changed for another. On this account, therefore, we may strongly infer that no abrogation or change of the Sabbath was ever intended under the Christian dispensation; for, if neither Christ, who was faithful as a son, and who assured his disciples that he had made known to them all things that he had heard of his Father,—nor St Paul, the great apostle of the Gentile world, who appeals to others that he had not kept back anything useful from them, nor shunned to declare to them all the counsel of God,—have signified anything concerning either the abrogation or change of the Sabbath, it is a strong indication that such an abrogation or change was no part of the will of God, which was to take place under the Christian dispensation." (Pp. 42, 43.)

Again: "We never read of any complaint which the Jews ever made on account of any pretended attempt to set aside the seventh-day Sabbath. Whoever impartially considers the great bickerings which a declaring the Gentile converts *only* exempted from the necessity of submitting to circumcision, and some other rites of the law of Moses, perpetually occasioned from the Jewish converts for a considerable number of years after the death of Christ, as plainly appears from the history of the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St Paul, will not, I imagine, easily give in to the belief of their hushing up, in so very tame and silent a manner, this so very considerable an alteration, as they must have done, in case it obtained in the days of our Saviour or his apostles.

"'Tis not to be supposed the Jews would ever suffer the Sabbath to be changed, the due observation of which they justly imagined to be the very foundation, as it were, of all religion, without making any opposition, when they so long made such a stir and bustle about things of a much inferior kind." (P. 44.)

In reference to the incidents recorded in John xx. 19, 26, and Acts ii. 1, he asks: "But what relation have any of these actions to a Sabbath? Or where have we any intimation that any, or all of them taken together, should constitute that day of the week the Christian Sabbath, on which they should happen? And if they

have no natural relation to any such thing, nor are signified by a proper authority to be interpretative of it, I know no one Protestant principle that will justify our concluding them as so many signals of a change of the Sabbath." (P. 56.)

He contends that the words of Paul in Rom. xiv. 5; Gal. iv. 10; and Col. ii. 16, "do not in the least infer an abrogation of the Sabbath, unless we will set St Paul against himself, as well as against our blessed Saviour;" and admits that "if these Scriptures imply a freedom from all obligation to observe the seventh-day Sabbath, they equally free us, if such a confused state of things can be called a freedom, from all obligation to observe any other day of the week whatsoever as a Sabbath." (P. 79.) This freedom is what the Reformers so often claimed; but the conclusion is by no means inevitable that it sets Paul at variance with himself. If, as some think, the Sabbath began with Moses, and the Decalogue was imposed exclusively on the Jews—or if, as others hold, the primeval Sabbath-law has ceased to be binding—it is easy to reconcile the observance of the Sabbath by Paul, a Jew, with his approbation of Gentile Christians at Rome who "esteemed every day alike," and who, in "not regarding the day, to the Lord did not regard it." Nor is there any greater inconsistency in his reproving the Gentile converts in Galatia for "observing days," and the Jewish and Gentile brethren at Colosse for judging each other "in respect of the Sabbath-days."

The sufficiency of the "six texts" usually quoted from the New Testament to prove the transference of the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday (above, p. 18), is denied by the Seventh-day Baptists on the same grounds on which Milton pronounces them so inadequate that, if he had believed the Decalogue to be a code of laws binding on Christians, he would have kept Saturday holy himself. (Above, pp. 53, 54.)

One of Brabourne's arguments against the change of the day was quoted in vol. i., p. 158; and having succeeded in procuring a copy of Thomas Bampfield's works since the 189th and 191st articles were printed, I may here quote a portion of his reply to the argument of the Puritans from the proceedings of the Christians at Troas (Acts xx. 7). He says:—"The first day of the week, they guess, was Sunday, which I shall not controvert, provided they will admit (which I think they will not deny) that it was Paul's manner to keep the seventh-day Sabbath, Acts xvii. 2; and provided they tell us what part of Sunday this was; for it seems to me (and I think to these objectors also) to be the evening after the seventh day, which evening was the beginning of Sunday, as the evening was the beginning of every other day of the week, Gen. i. 5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31. And that it was in the evening after the Sabbath, I think probable from his being ready to depart on the morrow (*i.e.*, on Sunday), and from his speaking till midnight and till break of day, ver. 7, 11.

"And they guess the breaking of bread there was the Lord's

Supper, which, they guess, the disciples did there once come together to do upon the first day of the week, and therefore, they guess, did upon the first day of every week then and ever after; and Paul's preaching to them then, they guess, was because the seventh day was changed to the first day; but when, where, or by whom, they show us not, but generally acknowledge to be nowhere found in the Scriptures; only we must take their word for it, which without a word from the Lord I cannot satisfy myself to do.

"In answer to which objection the reader may take notice, that the Greek word here, 'preached,' is the same Greek word which is rendered 'reasoned,' Acts xvii. 2, where Paul, as his manner was (his constant manner was), went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days (*i.e.*, seventh-day Sabbaths), he preached to them out of the Scriptures; and is the same Greek word which is rendered 'reasoned,' Acts xviii. 4, where Paul reasoned (*i.e.*, preached) in the synagogue every Sabbath: and he that (without prejudice) considers those two places, will see somewhat how far this goes in answer to the objection.

"Now, if we do admit that once (for 'tis but once) 'Paul with the disciples came together, upon the first day of the week, to break bread;' and if we should admit, that breaking of bread was giving and receiving the Lord's Supper, I say it is but once, that is, but one instance,—but one fact,—which was never yet understood to make a new or repeal an old law; and it would be a very dangerous doctrine to affirm, that one fact done by the Apostles and those disciples who were at Troas, and that upon a special occasion, should have the force of a law, to repeal or alter one of the Ten Commands to all the world in all after ages.

"And this once was upon occasion of Paul's being to depart on the morrow (*i.e.*, on Sunday).

"This was but once that Paul preached upon the first day, but his constant custom was to preach on the Sabbath-days, Acts xvii. 2; and that upon every Sabbath-day, Acts xviii. 4. The other is pretended to be but once.

"And not one word of instituting the first day, or repealing the seventh day." (*An Enquiry whether the Lord Jesus Christ made the World, and be Jehovah, and gave the Moral Law? and whether the Fourth Command be Repealed or Altered?* By Tho. Bampfield. Lond. 1692. P. 55.)

He thinks that by "breaking of bread" common eating is meant (which the same Greek word signifies in Acts xxvii. 35; Matt. xiv. 19; xv. 36; Mark viii. 6, 19): "But suppose," says he, "it were the Lord's Supper, 'tis likely Paul, having kept the Sabbath with them, as his manner was, and intending to be gone the next morning (*i.e.*, on Sunday morning), they met to have the Lord's Supper together, and after supper, that Paul preached to them, and talked long, till break of day, and then departed, which seems to be Sunday morning." (P. 57.)

With reference to the origin of this sect, I find from a passage in Erasmus that at the early period of the Reformation when

he wrote, there were Sabbatarians in Bohemia, who not only kept the seventh day, but were said to be so scrupulous in resting on it, that if anything went into their eyes they would not remove it till the morrow. He says: "Nunc audimus apud Bohemos exoriri novum Judæorum genus, Sabbatarios appellant, qui tanta superstitione servant Sabbatum, ut si quid eo die inciderit in oculum, nolint eximere; quasi non sufficiat eis pro Sabbato Dies Dominicus, qui Apostolis etiam erat sacer, aut quasi Christus non satis expresserit quantum tribuendum sit Sabbato." (*De Amabili Ecclesiæ Concordia; Op.* tom. v. p. 506; Lugd. Bat. 1704.)

Hospinian of Zurich, in his treatise *De Festis Judæorum et Ethnicorum*, cap. iii. (Tiguri, 1592), replies to the arguments of these Sabbatarians. Calvin's invective in his *Institutes* (see above, i. 129), is directed rather against such as maintained in his time, as the Puritans afterwards did in England, that the Lord's Day is the Sabbath.

261. Stukeley, William, M.D., F.R.S., *Rector of St George's, Queen Square, London* (*born* 1687; *died* 1765).—National Judgments the consequence of a National Profanation of the Sabbath; a Sermon on Lam. ii. 6. Lond. 1742. 4to.

262. Shuckford, Samuel, D.D., *Rector of All-Hallows, Lombard Street, London* (*died* 1754).—The Sacred and Profane History of the World Connected; with a Treatise on the Creation and Fall of Man. Lond. 1743. 4 vols. 8vo.

263. Foster, James, D.D., *a celebrated Dissenting Minister at Pinners' Hall, London* (*born* 1697; *died* 1753).—Sermon on the Sabbath and the Moral Ground of Public Worship; in his Sermons, vol. iv., pp. 253–284. Lond. 1744. 8vo.

Dr Foster argues for the positive character of the Sabbath. In this and other respects he agrees with Le Clerc.

264. Kennicott, Benjamin, D.D., *Canon of Christchurch, Oxford* (*born* 1718; *died* 1783).—Two Dissertations: 1. On the Tree of Life, with some Observations on the Creation and Fall of Man; 2. On the Oblations of Cain and Abel. 2d edition. Oxford, 1747.

Though justly honoured by Biblical scholars for his important

services in collating the manuscripts of the Hebrew Scriptures, correcting the text, and advocating that revisal of our English version which is still but hoped for, it must be allowed that as an *interpreter* of those writings Dr Kennicott is far less entitled to our esteem. He is ingenious, indeed; but rash, fanciful, ill-furnished with the requisite knowledge, and apt to take narrow views of his subjects.

In the second of these Dissertations he treats at considerable length of the patriarchal Sabbath, which, with several previous writers, he believes to have been observed, not on the seventh, but on the *first* day of the week. (See above, pp. 40, 73, 86, 101, 175.) Borrowing from Mr Bedford, and elevating to a *probability*, the conjecture that in the first ages of the world all the special communications between God and men *took place upon the Sabbath*, and that on it, in like manner, all sacrifices by the patriarchs were offered, he concludes that "*therefore* this command to Noah, 'Come thou, &c. into the ark' (Gen. vii. 1), was given on the Sabbath-day." The weekly employments of Noah till the end of the Flood are then minutely traced by him. During the first week, the ark receives its freight; and "after seven days," *i.e.*, on the Sabbath, the waters begin to rise, and Noah rests and worships. On the day before another Sabbath, he sends out a dove for the first time, "probably that he might the better know how to adapt his devotions on the day following, either by praying to God for some further token of his loving-kindness, or by praising him for the tokens already vouchsafed him." At the end of a third week the dove is again sent forth, and by returning empty makes the patriarch aware that the waters are still on all the earth: he "therefore probably spent the next day (the Sabbath) in praying for their abatement." Staying "yet other seven days," he sends forth the dove a third time, "no doubt with the same view as before," and now it returns with an olive leaf. But when despatched after a like period, *i.e.*, "on the day before the Sabbath, as usual," it returns to the ark no more. Noah then looks forth, and, seeing the ground, is so thankful for his deliverance "that he doubtless employed the next day (which was the weekly Sabbath) in acts of gratitude and praise." On the fourth Sabbath after this, the ground being now dry, he is ordered to quit the ark; and "as he had spent six days, or the time between one Sabbath and another, in going into the ark with all the creatures, *so probably the same time was spent in bringing them out again.* Noah's labour being therefore again ended on the day before the Sabbath, and himself set ashore safe upon the new world, he the next day put together a few stones for an altar unto the Lord, and with a grateful heart offered a sacrifice to God his deliverer." Having drawn this fanciful picture, Dr Kennicott fondly regards it as "*conclusive for Noah's observation of a Sabbath*, as well as his computation of time by weeks." (Pp. 173–6.)

In the book of Job, too (i. 6; ii. 1), he finds plain traces of that patriarch's observance of the Sabbath.

For the words in our translation of the Fourth Commandment, "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," he substitutes "the Sabbath *to* the Lord thy God." This is also Bishop Hooper's rendering, as we saw above, i. 137. The phrase may mean *a rest in honour of Jehovah*, and so it is understood by Spencer and his school (above, ii. 78, 110, 112). By Dr Kennicott, however, as by most English theologians, it is interpreted as "a rest from labour to attend upon the worship of God." (P. 137.)

With respect to the injunction that the seventh day should be kept holy by strangers within the gates of Israel, he says—"This mention of the stranger's being to observe a Sabbath is a proof that the command of a Sabbath is not merely Jewish, as has frequently been asserted. No stranger could join in eating the Passover without being first circumcised, and thereby initiated into Judaism (Exod. xii. 43, 44); but a stranger might, nay was obliged (we find) to keep the Sabbath, though he had not been circumcised. The reason of which remarkable distinction is, that circumcision was a *national*, and the Sabbath an *universal* institution: the former given in command to Abraham, and obligatory only on his descendants; while the latter was given in command to Adam, the father of all mankind." (Pp. 137–8.)

Now, it is a pure assumption that the Sabbath-keeping strangers were uncircumcised; and, whatever might be the case in this respect, we know from Deut. xxxi. 12 that "strangers within the gates" (whom theologians usually consider to have been *proselytes to Judaism*, circumcised or otherwise), were required by Moses not only to keep the Sabbath, but to "observe to do ALL *the words of this law*." Grotius—who speaks of these strangers as if they were mere resident foreigners, and who thinks the notion of a universal Sabbath-law inconsistent with the declaration that the weekly rest was a sign between Jehovah and his chosen people (Exod. xxxi. 13–17)—supposes that such foreigners were included in the Fourth Commandment, merely to prevent them from disturbing the civil order, and from gaining an undue advantage over the Israelites by trading while the nation was at rest. (See above, i. 220, 221.)

By the modern Rabbins, and many Christian writers, the converts from heathenism to Judaism are distinguished into two classes, called *proselytes of the gate*, and *proselytes of righteousness*. The first are defined to be Gentiles who resided in the land of Israel, or even elsewhere, and without being circumcised, or otherwise observing the law, feared and worshipped the true God, and obeyed seven precepts, which are said, though without any warrant from Scripture, to have been given by God to Noah. These so-called Noahical precepts enjoin,—1. Obedience to judges, magistrates, and princes; 2. Abstinence from the worship of false gods, and from superstition and sacrilege; 3. Also from cursing the name of God, blasphemies, and false oaths; 4. From incestuous and unlawful unions; 5. From effusion of the blood of living animals, murder, wounds, and mutilations; 6. From theft, fraud,

lying, &c.; and, 7. From eating any part of a living animal. Proselytes of this class are thought by those writers to be mentioned in Acts ii. 5; viii. 27; x. 2, 22; xiii. 16, 50; and it is conceived that by observing the seven precepts, they might, through grace and piety, hope for eternal life.

Proselytes of the second class, again, are represented to have been those who, by circumcision and obedience to the whole law, became members of the commonwealth of Israel.

Among the writers who thus divide the proselytes into two classes, are Lord Barrington (*Theol. Works*, ii. 265–358), Dr Benson (*Hist. of the First Planting of the Christian Religion*, i. 54, *et seq.*), and Dr Macknight (*Transl. of the Apostolical Epistles*, Pref. to Galatians). On the other hand Dr Lardner, followed by Doddridge, argues powerfully against the existence of any proselytes but such as the second class are described to have been. (Lardner's *Credibility*, ch. xviii. of Supp. to Part II.; also ch. vii. of "Remarks on Dr Ward's Dissertations;" in his *Works*, ed. 1815, vol. iii., pp. 395–400; v. 498–504. Doddridge's *Family Expositor*, notes on Acts x. 2; xi. 20; xv. 3, 7, 20; Gal. iv. 8.) The proposition of Lardner is, "that there never were, in ancient times, among the Jews, two sorts of proselytes; and that all those men who, in the Old Testament, are called proselytes, or strangers, or strangers within thy gates, were men circumcised." (Vol. v. p. 498.)

The reason why this question has been so amply discussed, is not any bearing of it on the obligation of the Sabbath, but the advocacy, by those whom Lardner opposes, of the opinion that the apostolic letter in Acts xv. 23–29, *was addressed only to Christians who before their conversion were proselytes of the gate.* If this position were established, there would no longer be any ground for believing that *other* Gentile converts were then required, or are now obliged, to abstain from meat offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled.

As to the Sabbath, Lord Barrington says: "Though I am of opinion with Spencer that a proselyte of the gate was enjoined to keep the Sabbath by the Fourth Commandment, for the reasons which he gives; yet I cannot but agree with him, and Selden too, that the Jews, at and before our Saviour's time, were so far from thinking proselytes of the gate bound to keep the Sabbath, that they punished them severely if they did; so that there could be no room for question, debate, or advice, about the proselytes of the gate keeping the Sabbath, though they were enjoined to observe it by the Fourth Commandment." (*Theol. Works*, ii. 276.) If the fact was so, we must reject the notion lately propounded with a wonderful degree of confidence by a writer in *The Church of England Quarterly Review* (Jan. 1855, p. 114), that because the Fourth Commandment had a clause binding (as he supposes) on proselytes of the gate, the apostles *needed not* to impose Sabbath-observance by their letter, since they thereby, says he, "solemnly declared that Gentile Christians were proselytes of the gate"! But even if we assume, not only that *there was a distinct class of proselytes*

of the gate and that these were *the strangers mentioned in the Fourth Commandment*, but also that the precept *was obeyed by them*—is it credible that the apostles, in a document so precise and formal, could leave the important duty of Sabbath-keeping to be *inferred*, either by those immediately concerned, or by us who do not associate with the Jews, and may be ignorant of important special circumstances in the case of "the brethren which were of the Gentiles in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia"?

265. BOLTON, ROBERT, *Dean of Carlisle* (*born* 1697; *died* 1763).—Letter to a Lady, on Card-playing on the Lord's Day. Lond. 1748. 8vo.

266. HEBERSTREIT.—Dissertatio de Sabbato ante Legem Mosaicam existente. Lipsiæ, 1748.

267. TALBOT, CATHERINE, *Niece of Lord Chancellor Talbot* (*born* 1720; *died* 1770).—The Rambler, No. 30; 30th June, 1750.

The observance of Sunday in a devout, calm, but cheerful manner, is here recommended in an allegorical way. Miss Talbot wrote also *Reflections on the Seven Days of the Week*, of which a sixth edition was published at London in 1770, 12mo. pp. 55. It is included in her *Works*, Lond. 1795.

Other notices of the usual lax mode of spending the Sunday in London about the middle of last century, will be found in *The World*, No. 21, 24th May 1753; in *The Connoisseur*, No. 26, 25th July 1754; and in Dr Webster's pamphlet, mentioned in the next article.

268. WEBSTER, WILLIAM, D.D., *Vicar of Ware, in Hertfordshire* (*born* 1689; *died* 1758).—The Scripture History of the Sabbath. Lond. 1751. 8vo. Pp. 47.

269. PARRY, RICHARD, D.D., *Rector of Wichampton* (*born* 1722; *died* 1786).—The Christian Sabbath as Old as the Creation; a sermon on Mark ii. 27. Lond. 1752. 4to.

270. BROWNE, MOSES.—Sunday Thoughts. In Three Parts. Adapted to the various parts of the Christian Sabbath; and its different Duties, Exercises, and Employments. Lond. 1753. 12mo. Pp. 240.

271. A Letter to an Officer in the Army, on Travelling on Sundays. Lond. 1757. 8vo. Pp. 50.

272. STEFFE, JOHN.—Five Letters, containing . . . . V. Reflections on the Christian Sabbath, showing the excellent Wisdom and Policy of that Institution, both as an interval of Rest from bodily labour, and a season for Religious Knowledge, Piety, and Devotion. Lond. 1757. 8vo. Pp. 127.

273. CHANDLER, SAMUEL, D.D., *an eminent Dissenting Minister at Peckham, near London* (*born* 1693; *died* 1766).—The Original and the Reason of the Institution of the Sabbath; in two discourses, preached at Salter's Hall, Dec. 17, 1760, to the revived Society for the Reformation of Manners. Lond. 1761. 8vo. Pp. 74.

Dr Chandler teaches that the Sabbath was instituted at the creation as a memorial of that work; that the first day of the week was the Sabbath-day till the time of Moses; that "God's blessing and sanctifying it is his separating that day from all servile works, and the common occupations in which men are engaged, that it might be a blessed day to mankind, a day of perpetual rest and refreshment" (p. 17); that were it an appointment only of the Mosaic law, Christians would be under no obligation to observe it, —"because that the whole law is abolished, by the death of Christ, in all its institutions whatsoever, except the moral part of them, which still carry with them an unrelaxed obligation, not because they are parts of the Mosaic law, but because they are in their own nature of perpetual force" (p. 37); but that, the Sabbath having been instituted at the beginning, Christians are for that reason bound to observe the unrepealed primeval law, and "if Christianity doth not abrogate the observation of it, it enjoins it" (p. 46). In opposition to the ascetics, he holds that Isa. lviii. 13, though prohibiting the Jews from secular employments, luxurious indulgences, irregular gratifications, and speaking, as they too often did, of the rest of the Sabbath as an unreasonable, troublesome thing, does not authorize the belief that there is anything in the institution "that leads us to practise on it the rigid severities of a fast, to clothe ourselves with a sour aspect, to become unconversable, to speak of nothing but what is of a religious nature, to do nothing but what is an act of devotion, or so to perpetuate and lengthen out the services of religion on them, as to render them tiresome and fatiguing both to the mind and body of those who

perform them, disgustful and unpleasing to those who engage in them, and so as to make the serious and profitable attention to them almost impracticable.

"Some," he adds, "have carried this matter to an unreasonable height, and made the Lord's-day the most tedious and undesirable one in the whole week; whereby they have prejudiced many against the day itself, and the necessary services of it. I cannot help calling this an unwarrantable superstition, for which there is no foundation in reason or revelation. The social duties of piety in families are necessary every day, and therefore no truly religious man will neglect them on the Lord's-day, but perform them in such a manner as shall render them most pleasing and profitable to himself and all who are about him. And such as are involved in secular affairs all the rest of the week, will, if they are wise, devote some part of this day to affairs of an higher kind; to reflection, self-converse, the correcting their errors, the establishing their best resolutions and dispositions, the guarding themselves more effectually against the snares of life and the corruptions of the world, and improving their dispositions for the happiness of the life to come. But public worship, and the solemn acknowledgement of God as the Creator and Redeemer of the world, is an essential, indeed the principal and distinguishing part of the sanctification of this day, as enjoined by the original institution. And when we have seriously engaged in these services, what have we to do but to be thankful to God, pleased with ourselves, and cheerful in our families; and I see nothing in the day, or the original manner of sanctifying it, that should debar me from any kind of cheerful conversation becoming a good man, that is consistent with the worship I have been engaged in, and that doth not tend to wear off my good impressions, or unfit me for the future duties of my calling and station." (Pp. 29–31.)

274. TAYLOR, JOHN, *a learned Unitarian Minister at Norwich* (*born* 1694; *died* 1761).—A Scheme of Scripture Divinity, chapter vi. (In Bishop Watson's Collection of Theological Tracts, i. 28–32.)

275. KENNEDY, JOHN, *Rector of Bradley in Derbyshire* (*died about* 1770).—A complete System of Astronomical Chronology; unfolding, ... 4. That at the going out of Egypt, the original Sabbath was changed; 5. That our Saviour rose from the dead on the seventh day of the week, &c. Lond. 1762. 4to.

276. DODDRIDGE, PHILIP, D.D., *an eminent Dissenting Minister at Northampton* (*born* 1702; *died* 1751).

—A Course of Lectures on the Principal Subjects in Pneumatology, Ethics, and Divinity. Lond. 1763. 4to. (Reprinted at London in 1794, 2 vols. 8vo.; and included in his Miscellaneous Works, 1 vol. imperial 8vo., Lond. 1830.)

Lectures 198 and 199 are on the Sabbath and the Lord's Day. The arguments for and against a primeval Sabbath are given; and, as to the Fourth Commandment, it is allowed that "the observation of the Sabbath is not to be urged as of universal obligation, merely because it is to be found in the Jewish Decalogue, and that its place there only obliged the Jews; since, in the preface to those ten commandments, their deliverance from Egypt is urged as a reason for observing them; and the Fifth Commandment is enforced by promises peculiar to the Jews; not to insist on the addition in Deut. v. 15, which is probably to be considered as the words of Moses, not of God, and a comment on the Fourth Commandment, rather than a part of it." In Lecture 209, it is said more absolutely, that "no one is by the Christian dispensation obliged to obey any part of the Mosaic law, as such, any more than he would have been if that law had never been given."

In observing that Dr Wright has endeavoured to prove from Luke xxiii. 56 that the law of the Sabbath was intended also to oblige Christians, Doddridge makes a remark which is extensively applicable to theologians—namely, that "he seems to forget that the persons spoken of there were then Jews." And the lecturer holds that "the rigour of the Jewish Sabbath is by no means to be brought into the Christian constitution, since there is such a silence in the New Testament upon this head."

In his *Family Expositor*, the Lord's Day is several times adverted to. From a note on 1 Cor. xvi. 2, it appears that he is one of those who understand Paul's injunction to the Corinthians to be, that they should put their contributions into the church-treasury on the Lord's Day (see above, p. 177). On Col. ii. 16 he remarks, that "it is certainly most arbitrary to pretend" (as the Seventh-day Baptists, and even some Puritans do) "that these words do not include *a weekly Sabbath*, when there was no other solemnity so *generally* signified by that name, though the use of the plural number shows that *all* days of *sacred rest* appointed by Moses were to be taken in." And his note on Rev. i. 10 is as follows:—"It is so very unnatural, and contrary to the use of the word in all other authors, to interpret this [*i. e.*, "the Lord's Day"] of the Jewish Sabbath (as Mr Baxter justly argues at large), that I cannot but conclude with him, and the generality of Christian writers on this subject, that this text strongly infers the *extraordinary* regard paid to the first day of the week in the Apostle's time, as a day solemnly consecrated to Christ, in memory of his resurrection from the dead."

It is plain from this passage, as well as from the tenor of his two lectures, that Doddridge held with Baxter that the Sabbath is entirely abolished, and that the Lord's Day is an independent Christian institution, which has come down to us from the apostolic times. (See above, p. 28.) He falls into the common error of attributing to Ignatius, instead of an interpolator, the giving of the title "Queen of days" to the Lord's Day (see above, i. 120); and, what is more surprising, he adds that "Pliny likewise speaks of it as the sacred day of the Christians." The truth is, that "a stated day" is all that Pliny mentions in relation to the religious assemblies of Christians; and there is nothing to show that it was not the *seventh* day—which, as we have frequently seen, continued long to be observed by Christians of the Jewish race. Nay, it is possible, though improbable, that the stated day was no weekly one at all, but occurred at some shorter or longer interval. (See above, i. 118.)

277. Reports of Cases argued and adjudged in the Court of King's Bench during the time Lord Mansfield presided in that Court. By Sir James Burrow, Knight. 4th ed., Lond. 1812. (Case of Swann *v.* Broome, 28th Nov. 1764; in vol. iii. pp. 1598–1602.)

The report of this case contains a history, by Lord Mansfield, of the English law and usage as to the sitting of the courts of justice on Sundays.

278. JENNINGS, DAVID, D.D., *pastor of a Dissenting Congregation in Old Gravel Lane, Wapping* (*born* 1691; *died* 1762).—Jewish Antiquities, vol. ii.; book iii. chap. 3. Lond. 1766. 2 vols. 8vo. (Ninth ed., Lond. 1837.)

279. A Dissertation on the Weekly Festival of the Christian Church; in which the principal questions concerning Sunday and the Sabbath are discussed. Lond. 1768. 18mo. Pp. 256.

Dr Kippis, in a note to Doddridge's 198th Lecture, attributes this anonymous book to a Mr Amner—I presume Richard Amner, a dissenting minister, who was born in 1736, and died in 1803. It is written with that moderation which generally characterizes the theological productions of its time.

Though unable to find in Scripture conclusive evidence that the Sabbath was instituted at the beginning, he infers from reason, analogy, and the mention of the week in the patriarchal history, that such was probably the case. Yet he "does not mean to assert

that even the Mosaic account of the creation is agreeable in every part to the theories of philosophy which are now in vogue, and with which, according to some, it hath a seeming dissonance. I have presumed," says he, "to think that the design in the first three chapters of Genesis may have been to give such a popular account of the several subjects they treat of, as should be sufficient for the religious faith and practice of mankind, while the true theory of them is rather veiled than revealed, and was designed to be so, under a mixture of allegorical representations and original facts, in consequence of which it hath hitherto been hidden, and ever will be so, from the busy curiosity and useless knowledge of mankind. Nor will they be hasty to condemn this mode of interpretation who shall consider that even Jesus, the greatest teacher of men, did deliver his heavenly doctrine in like manner, and sometimes for reasons which seem not to have been altogether dissimilar. John iii. 11, 12; Luke viii. 10; John vi. 63." (Pp. 63, 64.)

In this passage we see the influence of the general reception which had now been given to the Copernican System and the Newtonian Philosophy. By many theologians besides Mr Amner, the difficulty of giving any longer a literal interpretation to the narrative of the creation was frankly acknowledged: See, for instance, Dr Conyers Middleton's *Essay on the Allegorical and Literal Interpretation of the Creation and Fall of Man*, and several other pieces, in his *Miscellaneous Works*, ii. 123, 189, 208, 272, 286 (Lond. 1752); Bishop Newton's *Dissertation on the History of the Creation*, in his *Works*, ii. 65, 71 (Lond. 1782); Dr Price's *Sermons on the Christian Doctrine*, p. 376 (Lond. 1787); Dr Geddes's Preface to his *Translation of the Bible*, p. vii. (Lond. 1790), and his *Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures*, p. 23 (Lond. 1800). I have elsewhere quoted several of these writers (*Sabbath Laws*, &c., pp. 89, 90, 548); besides showing, in opposition to Archbishop Sumner, that Sir William Jones was of the same opinion (*Ib.* p. 92).* In the same book, p. 189, may be seen also the

* Dr Owen in the previous century had listened with apprehension to the advocates of the Copernican System (see above, p. 25); but when the Newtonian Philosophy had been introduced, some forty or fifty years later, into the course of study at Cambridge, Dr Samuel Clarke, who was a friend of its illustrious author, and the chief promoter of its study at the University, found reason to suggest, in his *Exposition of the Church Catechism*, that "possibly the six days of creation might be a typical representation of some greater periods." (Clarke's *Works*, iii. 681.) His ingenious contemporary Dr Thomas Burnet, more boldly asserted this theory in the Second Epistle appended to his *Archæologiæ Philosophicæ*. (No. 246; above, p. 176.) He there expresses to a friend the opinion that, as the Sabbath was a shadow or type of that heavenly repose which the righteous will enjoy when this world has passed away, "so these six days of creation are so many periods, or millenniums, for which the world, and the toils and labours of our present state, are destined to endure." (P. 511; 2nd ed., Lond. 1728.) After combating the hypothesis of a primeval Sabbath, and adducing various Scripture passages which,

opinions of Bishop Conybeare, Dr James Foster, and Dr Paley, on the question, Whether Christians are bound to defend the truth of all the historical narratives in the Old Testament?

The Sabbath of the Jews, Mr Amner holds, "cannot be always and absolutely a rule and reason of behaviour to any other people than themselves; because the ordinance of the seventh day seems to have recommenced among them with new circumstances, and to have been modelled after the genius of their extraordinary law.

"I presume to say," he adds, "that the Fourth Commandment has not the nature and force of law with respect to us. The words of introduction, 'I am Jehovah, thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage,' sufficiently characterize the persons for whom the whole system was designed; and the words wrought into this very law of the Sabbath concerning 'the stranger which should be within their gates,' shew that it had, and was meant to have, a legal obligation upon none but Hebrews and Hebrew proselytes. And if we had none other instruction than what may be drawn from the Decalogue respecting this matter, the only question which could interest us would be this, How far it was our duty to conform to a law of God expressly given to another people, when the reason of it might seem to reach unto ourselves?" (Pp. 100–102.)

Nevertheless, he approves of "the very pious and laudable customs of causing the evidently reasonable and most important precepts of the Decalogue to be inscribed within our churches, and to be inserted in the forms of public devotion, and of catechetical instruction; by which means it is hoped that they will be frequently suggested to the mind, and may serve as a synopsis, or commonplace, of universal duty, whither and whence particular branches of it may be drawn or referred. In this view of them, the application of the Fourth Command to our times and circumstances is as easy as the application of any of the other; and the *legal* obligation of any of them is not, as I suppose, designed." (Pp. 102–3.)

In quoting the Fourth Commandment from Exod. xx., he gives its conclusion thus: "Wherefore the Lord blessed the *seventh* day and hallowed it." "Such," he observes, "is the version in other offices of the Church; and not the *Sabbath*-day, as in the authorized translation. And so, says Mr Hallet, 'the true reading is, as appears from the Greek, Syriac, and Arabic versions of this place, and

however historical they may seem, it is *impossible* to interpret literally (*e.g.*, Exod. xxiv. 9-11; xxxiii. 8-23), he concludes his epistle with the following candid appeal: "Only shew me that the letter of the narrative of the Six Days is consistent with the nature of God and of things, and most cordially will I embrace your manner of expounding it. But until you have healed this wound, in vain you will seek a remedy from any other quarter, and as it were from a new blow. You see me held fast by inflexible reasons; strike off these chains, unlock for me those fetters, and I will gladly accompany you in your path." (P. 542.) See also Michaelis, below, p. 219.

from the original passage, Gen. ii. 3.' See his *Notes and Discourses*, vol. iii." (P. 52.)

In pages 59-65, Mr Amner endeavours to reconcile Deut. v. 15 with Exod. xx. 11, 12, but as unsuccessfully as the others who have ignored the fact that the Decalogue in Deut. v., equally with that in Exod. xx., is given as a transcript of what was written on the tables of stone. (See above, i. 156; ii. 105, 157, 173.)

As for the hypothesis that the primeval Sabbath was the first day of the week, he thinks we are nowise concerned to prove it, and that the grounds on which it has been contended for are in no small degree uncertain and fanciful. (P. 109.)

Concerning the manner in which the Lord's Day should be spent, he agrees with Watts and Chandler.

280. SECKER, THOMAS, LL.D., *Archbishop of Canterbury* (*born* 1693; *died* 1768).—Lectures on the Catechism of the Church of England. Lond. 1769. (In his Works, vol. x.; Lond. 1771.)

In Lecture 21st, on the Fourth Commandment, the Archbishop expresses opinions similar to those of Dr Sharp (above, p. 141).

There are three sermons on the Sabbath in vol. vii. of his *Works*, pp. 295–374.

The twelve volumes of his *Works* have been reprinted in six; Lond. 1811.

281. ORTON, JOB, D.D., *an eminent Dissenting Minister at Shrewsbury* (*born* 1717; *died* 1783).—Religious Exercises recommended; or, Discourses on Secret and Family Worship, and the Religious Observation of the Lord's Day; with two Discourses on the Heavenly State, considered under the Idea of a Sabbath. Shrewsbury, 1769. (In his Practical Works, vol. ii.; Lond. 1842. 8vo.)

The opinions of the Puritans about the Sabbath are here taught by Dr Orton.

282. GILL, JOHN, D.D., *a learned Baptist Minister, Pastor of a Chapel in Carter Lane, near London Bridge* (*born* 1697; *died* 1771).—A Body of Doctrinal and Practical Divinity, book iii. chap. 8. Lond. 1769. 3 vols. 4to. (Reprinted in 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1839.)

283. MICHAELIS, Sir JOHN DAVID, *Professor of Theology and Oriental Literature in the University of Gottingen* (*born* 1717; *died* 1791).—Commentaries on the Laws of Moses. Translated from the German by Alexander Smith, D.D., Minister of Chapel of Garioch, Aberdeenshire. Lond. 1814. 4 vols. 8vo.

"The '*Mosaisches Recht*' of the learned Michaelis," says Dr Smith in the preface to his spirited translation, "was originally published at Frankfort on the Mayn, in six parts or volumes, between the years 1770 and 1775; and it appears, from the list of the author's works annexed to Professor Ilassencamp's Collection of Memoirs relative to his life and writings, that a second edition of the first five parts was completed between 1775 and 1780, and that the work had, before the year 1793, been translated into Dutch and Danish.

"From the time of his first appointment to a professorship of philosophy at Gottingen, in the year 1746, Michaelis, already eminent as an Oriental scholar, appears to have directed his chief attention to the critical illustration of the sacred writings; and the unrivalled success with which he prosecuted this most important branch of theology has been universally acknowledged in this country, since his valuable *Introduction to the New Testament*, rendered still more valuable by the notes and chastenings of Dr Marsh, has become accessible to English readers, by the elegant translation of that learned theologian."

The *Mosaisches Recht* is characterized by Professor Eichorn, in a Memoir of the Literary Character of his colleague Michaelis, as "a work before which every prior attempt of antiquarians and politicians vanishes like a shadow;—a work truly original, and to which we have scarcely anything on the subject of any government, ancient or modern, that is worthy to be compared. In all preceding treatises on the subject, every thing had been jumbled together in the most heterogeneous manner; ancient laws and institutions mingled with modern; ordinances truly Mosaic confounded with those of later times, as introduced, reformed, or, at least, altered, by the Persians, Greeks, or Romans; and the real statutes of Moses exchanged for mere Rabbinical regulations, originating either in excessive scrupulosity or silly misconception. In this state of things, and while, in their inquiries and speculations, authors on this subject betrayed only their credulity, and ignorance of political science, Michaelis made his appearance. In conducting his work, he examined the sources of information with all the aid of his historical skill and philosophical discrimination, and thus gave the subject an interest, which it could never have commanded, had he confined his attention to the mere illustration of the Mosaic constitution alone. For, those materials of that constitution, which every author before him had regarded with indifference, as mere matters of antiquarian speculation, he exhi-

bited in a political point of view; endeavouring to penetrate into the nature and origin of all its parts; illustrating these from analogous circumstances in the laws and government of other nations; and, with those general remarks which he offered relative to the end and design of the several statutes, combining others respecting their local or temporary expediency; together with such farther observations as are calculated to interest, and even to instruct, the philosopher, the politician, the historian, and the antiquarian, in their several pursuits." (Quoted in the Preface, p. xix.)

As the reader may desire to know fully how the Sabbath was regarded by so sagacious and learned a thinker as Michaelis, and as the book is both voluminous and scarce, I shall extract from it every important passage in which his views of this festival are contained. To what he says of it in its minor aspects, mere references, it is thought, will be enough.

Preliminary Observations on the Sabbath.—"The seventh day of the week was ordained to be a day of divine worship, of rest, of complete freedom from bodily labour, and of recreation. It is sufficiently known by the name of the Sabbath. The statutes respecting it are recorded in Exod. xvi. 22–30; xx. 8–11; xxiii. 12; xxxi. 12–17; xxxiv. 21; xxxv. 1–3; Numb. xv. 32–36; Deut. v. 12–15.

"I do not mean to speak of it here as a day of divine worship, but only as a day of recreation; partly because the former purpose more properly belongs to the province of theology and morals, and partly also because we know little as to the manner in which the Sabbath was, in the most ancient times, devoted to what we call divine worship. For from the practice of the Jews after their return from Babylon, when they assembled for prayer in their synagogues, heard the Bible read and explained, and received exhortations to duty, we can draw no inference as to the time of Moses, concerning which we know nothing but what he himself records, and in which the law not requiring explanation (because the language in which it was written was neither dead nor antiquated, but their mother-tongue understood by all), was only to be read over once every seven years.

"For the better understanding of the Mosaic law on this subject, and its comparison with the general rules of legislative policy, I must premise a few observations.

"That every people interested in the preservation of their religion must set apart, I will not say *a day*, but certainly a specific *time*, for divine worship, is obvious. This is a point, the proofs of which I willingly leave to theology, or even to philosophical ethics, from which I may here assume it as well understood. But besides this (and here I must beg leave, as it is more agreeable to present usage to employ the word *days* for *times*, without meaning, by *day*, either the precise period of twenty-four hours, or that from sun-rise to sun-set), there is a necessity for days of rest and pleasure.

"By unintermitted labour, the body becomes weakened, loses that activity and vigour which the alternations of labour, rest, and amusement produce, and grows soon old. Bodily labour otherwise, no doubt, increases strength; and the peasant who works with his hands will always be a stronger man than the person who folds them across his breast, or only writes with them: but then it must not be unceasing labour, and without repose, or else it will have the contrary effect. The man who is obliged to toil day after day without intermission, and especially if he has done so from infancy, becomes in a manner crampt, stiff, and awkward at all other bodily exercises; continues, as it were naturally, of small stature, and, like a horse daily hacked, is prematurely worn out. Alternation is the grand maxim of Dietetics, which, indeed, holds good so universally, that the very best rules of diet prescribed by the ablest physician, will be found in most cases detrimental, if too strictly observed. Even the exercises which serve to strengthen and refresh us, if we constantly use any one of them without variation, such as walking or riding, will become irksome and hurtful, if we are obliged to take it every day without intermission. The daily runner, who knows no intervals of rest, will not, it is true, be affected with hypochondria, but will, nevertheless, feel his health otherwise impaired. The postillion who rides every day, Sunday not excepted, commonly grows old before his time; and his whole figure shews that he has not had a healthy occupation. . . . .

"Putting all this, however, out of the question, that man can have no enjoyment of life who is obliged to toil perpetually, and in the same irksome uniformity of employment. Yet every man ought to have some enjoyment of life, were it only for a single day of recreation occasionally: wherefore else is he in the world? If he never tastes the pleasures of life, he soon dwindles into wrinkled insignificance. Nor is it merely rest from his daily toil that he ought, in justice, to enjoy on such occasions; but he should have it in his power to sport away the time in social enjoyment, in feasting, dancing, or whatever else is most agreeable to his taste, if not contrary to good morals. By this variety of pleasure the mind is roused from its dull uniformity, enlivened, and restored; the powers of the body are renovated; and it becomes more supple, and fitted for greater exertion. In short, the common man throws off the slave, the porter, the hind, the tailor; and the man of learning the dull pedant. *Augetur tum et coitus libido; quod viribus corporisque mentisque progeniei futuræ multum conferre solet.* Physicians, who ought certainly to be consulted on many points of legislative policy, will give the reader more ample satisfaction on this subject; which, indeed, is handled in several medical books, commonly to be met with. It were cruel to deprive even the slave of a share in such enjoyments, for they are, as it were, a recompence for the hardships of his life: and every man who lives, manifestly has a right to partake in them: and it were no less foolish than cruel; for his health, vivacity, and bodily

vigour will suffer in consequence of such privations. It is, therefore, prudent to allow him seasons of recreation: although selfish and tyrannical masters, who only look to immediate advantages, are, from their ignorance of human nature and the effects of unceasing labour, sometimes inclined to be of a different opinion.*

"There arises then a moral and political question, 'Can the day of divine worship be aptly united with the day of rest and enjoyment?' For my own part, I think it may; provided only we do not include all manner of vicious excesses under the term enjoyment: and, in fact, the question has been already thus unanimously decided many thousand years ago, by almost all the nations on the face of the earth; however much many gloomy moralists of these later times may have condemned entertainments, dancing, playing, and even afternoon companies and visits, as profanations of Sunday, and zealously, although much too late, endeavoured to prevent them. To set apart two days of every week for holidays, as Mr Von Justi once proposed, would leave too little time for necessary labours, and would, in fact, be reviving, under the sanction of the magistrate, *blue Monday*, or St Crispin's holiday, the abolition of which gave so much trouble to legislative authority, even to the Diet of Ratisbon itself, which only notices the most flagrant evils. It cannot be here objected that amusements are apt to degenerate into immoral practices, repugnant to the sanctity of the Sabbath—dancing, for instance, into intrigues—else must we also abolish going to church itself, in regard to which neither sex can pretend to be always actuated by spiritual considerations alone. It were rather to be hoped that amusements would keep within the bounds of morality and virtue, by being placed in the train of religion; and it should rather be an object of inquiry, Whether they might not be still more closely connected with religion, and thus many excesses be prevented.

"At any rate, it is contrary to that desire of variety which is implanted in human nature, to appropriate a *whole* day every week to devotion alone. The application of the mind for so long a time to one object, and an object too which does not affect the senses, is nothing less than labour of the hardest and most fatiguing kind; and devotion of this nature will generally lose in intensity, tenderness, and unconstrained spontaneous ardour, what it gains in duration. On this account also, therefore, it is expedient to divide the Sabbath between religious duties and lawful enjoyments; because one day will thus serve for what would otherwise require

* "The Dutch colonists in Surinam have been charged with regretting the conversion of any of their slaves to Christianity, and with endeavouring to prevent their having any information concerning it; because they are obliged to permit Christian slaves to keep Sunday. Whether this charge *is* true, or *was* so thirty or forty years ago (for, properly speaking, it depends on the *time*), I cannot tell. But, speaking hypothetically, and admitting its justice, the masters certainly did not understand their own interest, and, as is often the fate of avarice, deceived themselves."

two, and the more time for labour thus be gained to the community.

"That many zealous clergymen, and also many sabbatical laws, in framing which spiritual persons have had a hand, proceed upon very different principles from these, I am well aware; but this is not the place to dispute the point with them, either morally or theologically. Which of our principles are most according to the spirit of that law from which they borrow the very word *Sabbath*, will appear immediately." (Art. 194; vol. iii. pp. 150–5.)

Mosaic Ordinances respecting the Sabbath.—"Moses found a custom among the people established from the very earliest period, by which they solemnized the Sabbath-day, and it is probable that even the Egyptians had left this day to them, as a day of rest; at least he describes this solemnity as instituted by God immediately after the creation (Gen. ii. 1–3); and he nowhere mentions its having been abolished, or become obsolete. It appears, therefore, that he found it still subsisting * as a custom handed down from their ancestors; and thus it was not very necessary for him to describe circumstantially wherein it should consist, that being already familiar through common use. Hence we have from him no account of the manner in which they were to worship the Deity on this day, excepting only the statute respecting the public sabbatical sacrifice, in Numb. xxviii. 9, 10; for he adhered, in this point, to the usual practice from the days of their forefathers, and, at the same time, left the people at liberty to regulate their religious worship, which cannot always be perfectly uniform, and, as it were, fitted to one last, as circumstances, wants, or existing abuses might suggest. For example, *we* have sermons preached to us on the Sabbath-day, wherein the Bible is explained, which, after so many thousand years, when so many ancient things spoken of in it have become unknown, requires explanation; but to have *then* given discourses every week, to illustrate a book still new, and, to every one that could read, perfectly plain and intelligible, would have been superfluous labour; and had Moses meant to institute any such practice, he must have been conscious of not writing perspicuously. And yet our weekly sermons, which have

* "Others prove this from Exod. xvi. 22, 23, where, according to them, the Israelites, even before the giving of the ten commandments, would gather no manna on the Sabbath-day, and therefore collected a double portion on the Friday. But of this proof I cannot avail myself, because I have given a version of the passage different from the common one, and render ver. 23 in the plusquamperfect, *for the Lord* had *said*, &c. And thus I felt myself obliged to render it; for it were absurd to suppose that Moses should only *after* having been told that the Israelites had collected a double portion on account of the Sabbath, say, for the *first* time, *This is the divine command, to-morrow is the Sabbath in honour of Jehovah*, &c. As the Hebrew language has only a preterite tense, ויאמר may as well be the plusquamperfect as the imperfect or perfect; and verbs in the preterites must be rendered according as the scope and connection of the passage, and the idiom of our language, requires."

arisen from the needs of the common people, who can no longer understand the scriptures without aid and explanation, are actually one of the most important parts of our religious worship; and so useful, indeed, that we may almost rejoice in that *defect* which has occasioned them.

"We know not, therefore, with historical certainty, wherein the most ancient worship of the Israelites on the Sabbath-day consisted. Probably they may, as on other festive days, have sung hymns of praise to God, accompanied with dancing, and held feasts, to which, besides other friends, the priests, Levites, and indigent persons were invited; and if they resided near the sanctuary, they may have offered sacrifices, and thence made offering-feasts. In later times, we know, from history, that the Jews actually had Sabbath-feasts, to which they invited even persons with whom they were unacquainted.* Perhaps, likewise, parents were on this day to instruct their children in the knowledge of the Creator of heaven and earth; and public prayers were to be addressed to him, or whatever other service was customary. Only we must not at this period think of synagogues in every city, in which the law was read and expounded; for these were of much later origin, and Moses did not enjoin, what was afterwards introduced, the reading of his law every Sabbath, but only at the feast of tabernacles, in the sabbatical year (Deut. xxxi. 9–13); nor did he introduce any thing like the office of a preacher, properly so called; see Art. 52 [quoted below, p. 227]. We are, therefore, ignorant of many things relating to the ancient Sabbath; but the following particulars we find more expressly stated in the Mosaic writings.

"The seventh day was to be kept holy, in remembrance of God's having on that day rested from all his works, and was, therefore, sacred to the God who, in six portions of time, which Moses calls days, created all things, and in the seventh ceased to create any thing more, because the world was now complete, and as He wished it to be (Gen. ii. 1–3; Exod. xx. 11; xxxi. 17). Hence the celebration of the Sabbath was making a weekly profession, that they received and revered the Creator of heaven and earth as the true and only God, and was closely connected with the fundamental principle of the Mosaic legislation, illustrated in Art. 32, whose object was to keep the people from idolatry, and to maintain the worship of one God; and hence also the punishment of death was denounced against the wilful profanation of this solemnity. Here, however, an abuse might really still actually take place; for a superstitious worshipper of the stars, or, as Moses usually expresses it, of 'the host of heaven,' might have solemnized the seventh day in honour of Saturn, whom the Phœnicians revered as the Guardian God of their nation, and to whom they offered human sacrifices;

* "See Luke xiv. 1, and Wetstein's notes upon it. What Christ says in ver. 12, 13, 14, can only be fully understood in reference to a feast that formed a part of divine worship, and as such might look for a recompense from God; for we do not, in ordinary cases, expect that God should reward us in another world for every entertainment we give."

and, in fact, the Israelites themselves, when in the wilderness, in the days of Moses, clandestinely adored Saturn, and carried images of him in little booths about with them. Such idolaters, then, in solemnizing the seventh day, directed the secret intentions of their hearts to the planet Saturn. For this very reason, Moses found it necessary, not only most expressly to declare that the Sabbath was solemnized in honour of the God who, in six days, had created the heavens and the earth, and all their host (of course Saturn himself), and rested on the seventh day, but also to make the imitation of this rest an essential part of the keeping of the Sabbath. The reader may now peruse the passage relating to its institution and design, in Exod. xxxi. 13-17,—'Observe my Sabbaths; they are, to eternal ages, a sign of the engagement between me and you, wherein ye see that I have sanctified you to myself. For in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, but on the seventh he rested, and refreshed himself.'

"Among the Israelites, the day was not, as with us, reckoned from midnight to midnight, but from sunset to sunset. Of course, the Sabbath commenced at sunset.

"The Sabbath was to be a day of rest, partly, as just mentioned, in honour of the God who created heaven and earth, but partly also that man and beast might both be refreshed, and not have their bodily strength exhausted by uninterrupted labour. Of course, it was a day of rest, in the sense in which, in the preceding Article, I distinguished it from a day of divine worship. Moses expressly states it in Exod. xxiii. 12, as a design of the Sabbath, that 'the ox and the ass might have rest, and the servant and the stranger be refreshed.' For this reason, cessation from labour is enjoined not only to those who worshipped the true God on that day, but likewise to all foreigners residing within the land, though not believers at heart in the true religion, nor bound to any outward worship. Nor were even the beasts to be put to any work, as on other days (Exod. xx. 10; Deut. v. 14, 15). No person living under the Israelitish government was to be deprived of this rest, or to be prematurely stupified by unceasing toil, without all relaxation and enjoyment; nay, the very beasts were to partake in it. But, on this point, I have said what was necessary in Art. 167 [quoted below, p. 225], and need not here repeat it.

"This rest, however, was not to consist in perfect inactivity, and abstinence from all bodily motion, or from every thing that, by the chicanery of a scrupulous conscience, might be construed into labour. Indeed, a day of this description, during which a person dares not stir a foot for his amusement, but must be tortured with doubts in his mind, whether, by stretching out his hand, or by any other motion of his body, he may not be committing a sin, would be directly the reverse of a day of recreation. It would rather serve to render us melancholy, and we should only rejoice when it drew to an end. No doubt, the Sabbath of the Jews *did* assume an aspect of this strange description, in consequence of the numerous additions of minute observances introduced by the Pha-

risees, and often reprobated by Christ; and it would have an aspect still more gloomy, were we, according to the doctrine of some Christians, to look upon all worldly intercourse and pleasure as prohibited on this day, and to extend the prohibition likewise to all mental exertion, and, of course, to the repression of all thoughts not strictly devout, and to reading and writing. Such a day as this, without aught of what we call variety, would be a weekly plague of the most grievous kind. But of all those Jewish statutes which we find specified in the Talmud, and sometimes mentioned in the Evangelists as combated by Christ, Moses has not a word. Nor knows he anything of the Sabbath-day's journey, as it has been called, that is, of the prohibition of going more than 2000 ells from the city;* which is a mere addition of the ancients and the Pharisees. It is true no one would on the Sabbath have *gone* an errand for hire, nor durst any one have *ridden*, because, in that case, his horse, camel, or ass, would have had no day of rest; but, for his pleasure, he might have walked as far as he had a mind; and though he had fatigued himself dancing, he would not only have done nothing repugnant to the Mosaic law, but, on the contrary, have really acted conformably to its design.

"What Moses prohibits on the Sabbath, he himself terms עבודה, or מלאכת עבודה, which, according to the etymology of the word, means *the business of a servant*. But all bodily labour is so called, because we command our servants to perform it, or hire a workman for the purpose. What was to be comprehended under bodily labour, or, as it is elsewhere termed, מלאכה, *business*, everybody then knew and understood, from the ancient manner of solemnizing the Sabbath, and from the usage of the language; and, therefore, Moses nowhere found it necessary to give any definition of it. Two examples of it from his own history are, going out of the camp to gather manna (Exod. xvi. 22–30), and gathering sticks (Numb. xv. 32). But if a person took up anything that he saw

* "Whoever wishes to know more of this strange conceit may consult Lightfoot's *Horæ Hebraicæ*, on Acts i. 12. Moses, in Exod. xvi. 29, commanded the Israelites to stay at home on the Sabbath, and not go out, as on other days, to gather manna. Now, the Rabbins, detaching the clause, *stay at home*, or, as it strictly means, *sit every one in his place*, from its connection with the rest of the passage, insisted that it was a general prohibition against going out of the camp, and that when the Israelites were no longer in a camp, it held, in like manner, with respect to the city, out of which, of course, no one durst then go; but that as the space of 2000 ells round the city belonged thereto, consequently, if a person went only that distance from it, he did not go out of it; and his going thus far was lawful, and constituted what they termed a Sabbath-day's journey. A very ridiculous exposition certainly; and the beauty of it is, that, on this principle, in London a Jew may quite easily go two good German miles without breaking the Sabbath. Other fooleries of the Rabbins on this subject I will not produce; but this one I could not entirely overlook, because I perceive that some Christian literati have actually acceded to the notion of its being a Mosaic ordinance."

lying before him, or, in passing by a field of corn, plucked the ears, and ate the grain, as the disciples of Christ did (Matt. xii. 1), we must easily see that this is by no means the same thing with collecting sticks or manna. Without chicane, it cannot be called bodily labour; and a Sabbath on which such things were forbidden would rather be a day of punishment than of comfort.

"Of mental labour, Moses, in his sabbatical statutes, mentions not a word, nor was it necessary, considering the circumstances and occupations of his people; for the exertion of the mind requisite in divine worship must at any rate have been just as lawful as was the bodily labour which a case of exception, that will appear in the sequel, required. How Moses would have acted if he had had to do with a people among whom, as with us at present, a great many learned persons are entirely occupied in study, I have no disposition here to enquire.

"Certain things, which those theologians who hold the fourth commandment as still obligatory term *works of necessity*, and as such permit, were nevertheless actually included in the work forbidden by Moses. The kindling of fire, and the dressing of victuals, on the Sabbath, was unlawful (Exod. xvi. 23; xxxv. 3). Now to us, considering our climate and domestic arrangements, this would appear a very hard prohibition, especially if we contemplate it in reference to a day that lasts from midnight to midnight: And a day of rest, or refreshment, we should by no means think a right name for a Sabbath whereon we durst not, from morning to night, taste anything warm, nor in winter have any fire—but, rather, a day of penance. In fact, the Jews residing in northern climates feel the unsuitableness of such a Sabbath to such climates. They indeed contrive, by ovens constructed for the purpose, so to prepare their food, as that, if the fire be kindled in them immediately before the Sabbath begin, they can have a hot dinner next day; but still they often experience the inconvenience of having their victuals *miscooked*, unless they have very perfect cooks, which only rich people can afford; and a Jewish gentleman whom I questioned on this point told me that he laid his account with having his Sabbath's dinner spoiled at least twelve times a year. They are often obliged, likewise, to employ Christian servants on their Sabbath, and would be very ill off if they could not get them, or were themselves the only people, in a country like ours. Many Christian clergymen, however, who are of opinion that the fourth commandment still affects us under the New Testament, and that, excepting works of necessity and charity, all manner of labour is forbidden on our Sunday by God himself, do not abstain, notwithstanding, from having warm roast and boiled, on that day, at dinner; and thereby show how little that law is adapted to our climate, and to the arrangements of their kitchens.

"Now, in Palestine, the Sabbath, and especially as it commenced at sunset, had none of these inconveniencies; and, indeed, notwithstanding the prohibition of cooking and kindling fire, might have been a regular day of feasting. In our countries, the prin-

cipal meal is dinner, but in more southerly climates, supper; because in summer people have too little appetite for food in the heat of the day. Even in Italy, though not so far south as Palestine, we see that this plan had long prevailed; for among the Romans the principal meal, and that at which company were entertained, was their *cœna*. In this case, dinner becomes rather like a *déjeuner*, at which people are satisfied with a cold collation. Now, the Israelite, in the evening when the Sabbath commenced, could not only have a warm supper for himself and family, prepared in the afternoon of Friday, but might easily give as costly an entertainment as he had a mind. In Palestine, the sun, in the shortest days of winter, never sets before five o'clock in the afternoon—almost the very time when, at some courts, they now sit down to a dinner, which an ancient, without speaking very figuratively, would have called a *cœna*, or supper, and would have eaten with as much appetite as we do; and it was an easy matter to keep the victuals warm for an hour, when sunset happened too early. In their longest days, again, this takes place before seven, at latest—the precise hour of supper among our *bourgeois*. . . . .

"Whether the prohibition of kindling fire extended to fire necessary for warmth, or only to fire for cooking, I cannot with certainty say, and I almost doubt it; but allowing that they understood it in its strictest sense, they might easily hold out even in winter in so mild a climate, if, immediately before sunset, they made such a fire as to keep heat until next day; more especially, as, in southern countries, they usually fortify themselves against frost more by the aid of warm clothing than by the heat of fires. Even in France, which is but little farther south than Germany, they do this; and in Palestine more furs are said to be worn at this day than with us.* In fact, however, I believe the prohibition only affected kitchen-fires; for had fire for warmth been forbidden, I should have supposed, considering that in some parts of Palestine, such as those about Mount Lebanon, the cold in winter is pretty severe, that necessity would have taught the Israelites the discovery of some contrivance resembling the stove. . . . .

"There is still another respect wherein the Mosaic statutes relative to the Sabbath, though perfectly suited to the climate of Palestine, are by no means adapted to ours, and that is, in their permitting no work on that day in seed-time, or even in harvest. For us, this would be a great hardship, because in harvest we have often rainy weather, and in wet years many a man would lose his crop if he durst not avail himself of a favourable day for ingathering it, because it happened to be a Sunday. Hence our strictest regulations respecting the Sabbath, even those in the framing of which clergymen who believed in the divine authority of the day as still in force have had a hand, are wont to regard this as a work of necessity, and to make an exception in favour of the harvest. In Palestine, however, this was not necessary; for

* "See Busching's *Geography of Asia*, p. 326, 2d edit."

the weather in harvest is in general so steadily favourable that we find it, in 1 Sam. xii. 17, represented as a circumstance altogether extraordinary, that a thunder-storm should take place during wheat-harvest. In the warmest parts of that country, harvest begins about the middle of April; and it is finished everywhere in seven weeks, that is, it lasts till the beginning of June; but the rainy season usually ends in April, though occasionally there may be some rain in the latter part of April, old style, that is, in the very beginning of May; but, after that time, there falls no rain, or but very rarely, and it does no injury to the crop, because it does not last.

"Bodily labour requisite for divine service was not prohibited on the Sabbath; so that this formed an exception from the statute. Without severe labour beasts could not be slaughtered, and offered on the altar; and yet the daily morning and evening sacrifice was to be made, and even doubled, on the Sabbath; and wood was to be procured every day for the fire of the altar (Lev. vi. 8–13; Numb. xxviii. 3–10). According to a just analogy of this law, the Jews likewise offered sacrifices of all other kinds on the Sabbath; and Christ remarks, in regard to this point, that the priests in the temple broke the Sabbath without incurring guilt, and that *then* also a child was circumcised, if it happened to be eight days old (Matt. xii. 5; John vii. 23).

"The consequence of this was, that at the sanctuary, where alone offerings durst be made, sacrifice-feasts were held on the Sabbath; for anything that related to the preparation of the offering-meats was a duty of religion, instead of being a profanation of the sanctity of the day.

"On the wilful breach of the Sabbath by any kind of work, the punishment of death was inflicted (Exod. xxxi. 14, 15; Numb. xv. 32–36), as we shall notice under the head of *Penal Law*. [Art. 249, quoted below, p. 225.] I only here remark, that the reason of the severity of the law was, that as the Sabbath was meant to be a sign of their acknowledging the Creator of heaven and earth for their God, so the man who broke the Sabbath was considered as guilty of disowning that God, the worship of whom, as we have stated in Art. 82, was a fundamental principle of the Israelitish polity." (Art. 195, vol. iii. pp. 156–170.)

"Can war be classed with those works which Moses prohibited on the Sabbath? If so, it is not conceivable how a state could subsist under such a law. It would not so much as be secure against banditti; nor would the magistrate be able to maintain the public peace on the Sabbath, if any miscreants should then take it into their heads to disturb it. I am perfectly confident that Moses never gave any such strange law." (Art. 196; vol. iii. p. 170.)*

* Michaelis proceeds to discuss this point at considerable length; but it is enough to indicate his opinion.

In Article 198 (vol. iii. pp. 193–201), he treats of the political effects, objects, and uses of the three annual festivals instituted by Moses.

The Sabbath, as intended for Beasts.—"It was a part of the good treatment due to domestic animals, they were to be allowed to share the enjoyment of the sabbatical rest. On the people's own account this was no doubt necessary, because in general beasts can perform no work without man's assistance; but still Moses expressly declares that his commandment respecting the Sabbath had a direct reference to the rest and refreshment of beasts as well as of man. His words are, 'On the seventh day thou shalt rest from labour; that thine ox and thine ass may also rest, and thy servant and stranger may be refreshed.' (Exod. xxiii. 12; xx. 10; Deut. v. 14.)

"In fact, some such alternation of labour and rest seems necessary to the preservation of beasts; for those that perform the same kind of work day after day, without any interruption, soon become stupid and useless. At least, we see this the case with horses; and the reader will not take it amiss that a town-bred writer, having better access to observe the effects of labour on them than on oxen, should prefer taking an example from the former. A horse that has to travel three German miles every day will not hold out long; but, with intervening days of rest, in the same time, he will be able to go over a much greater space without injury. He will, for example, in ten days travel 35 German miles, with three resting days, that is, at the rate of five miles each day of the other seven. This fact is so well known, that in riding schools, one or two days of rest, besides Sunday, are usually allowed to the horses, in order to preserve their spirit and activity; whereas the post-horses, which are constantly at work, soon become stiff and unserviceable. The case is probably the same with other beasts of burden, although they do not require so many intervals of rest as horses. And hence the good treatment of beasts enjoined in the Mosaic law, and the sabbatical rest ordained for their refreshment, was highly expedient, even in an economical point of view, and wisely suited to the circumstances of a people whose cattle formed the principal part of their subsistence." (Art. 167; vol. ii. pp. 399-400.)

Capital Punishment of Profanation of the Sabbath.—"Every audacious transgression of the ceremonial law—in other words, of that law which prescribed the usages of divine worship, and the different ceremonies of purification that were to be performed in different cases—was regarded as an abandonment of the service of the true God, and, of course, as a transition to the service of other gods, punished with *extirpation*, that is, in the sense wherein the word seems *here* to be taken, *with death*. . . .

"Profanation of the Sabbath by working is in a particular manner to be numbered with those transgressions of the ceremonial law which were punished with death. (Exod. xxxi. 14–16; xxxv. 2.)

"The severity of punishment, in this instance, has given offence to many people who have speculated on the laws of Moses; for

they have conceived that every one who but once worked on the Sabbath was, without distinction, to be put to death; and then, in contemplating the Mosaic statutes prohibitory of the profanation of the *Sabbath*, they have thought of *our* laws relative to the profanation of *Sunday*, which we sometimes call *Sabbath-laws*, and which to sanction by capital punishment would certainly be the height of absurdity. I shall, to clear up this point, begin with the consideration of the latter; only I must first show how great the distinction is between what are called Sabbath-laws and profanations of the Sabbath.

"1. The civil laws of Moses presuppose a Sabbath prescribed by God Himself to the Israelites, and, of course, a law not to be altered by man. This our legislators can never presuppose; for although it be undeniable that, for the service of God, and religious instruction, it is necessary that a certain time should be set apart, either by the community themselves, who profess any particular religion, or by the church that wishes to propagate it among their posterity; yet the New Testament expressly teacheth us (Rom. xiv. 1–6; Col. ii. 16), that at present God has to us prescribed no such time, nor instituted any Sabbath, but left all this to be regulated by men themselves. Even our celebration of Sunday, although a very early *practice*, and originating probably with the apostles themselves, is never mentioned in their epistles as a *command*; and with the very same right, whereby we have altered other parts of the divine service of this day, as, for instance, in the abolition of the *love-feasts*, we might still, without any trespass of a divine command, appropriate any other day, or, as *we* actually do, but half a day, or even less, for the public worship of God. Should these positions be doubtful, as indeed some religious sects really entertain different ideas on this point, one thing is certain, that it is *not* in the symbolic books of the Lutheran church; for there it is quite explicitly declared that the observance of Sunday is not an ordinance of divine, but of ecclesiastical law. We shall now easily see how great the difference is to be accounted between the keeping holy a day by divine command, and only by authority of that church which happens to be protected by the state. To annex the punishment of death to its profanation, in the latter case, would certainly be very strange.

"2. Add to this, as already remarked more than once, that the true God was, in a civil sense, king of the Israelites, and the founder of their government; so that to disown Him was at the same time a crime against the state. But, as we have shown in Art. 195 [see above, p. 219], the Sabbath was sacred to Him, the God who made heaven and earth, and was to be a sign of His being the God of the Israelites; and therefore, by profanation of the Sabbath, a man seemingly denied the only true God.

"3. The resurrection of Christ, that fact in commemoration of which we solemnize Sunday, is a part of revealed religion; and yet it is quite possible that a person, otherwise rational, may doubt revealed religion; for, even in Christian States, those people are

usually tolerated who are not Christians, but Jews, for example, or votaries of natural religion. But what the Israelites acknowledged by their keeping the Sabbath, namely, the belief of the God who made heaven and earth, is a part of natural religion, and indeed a truth so evident and universal, that a person will not be apt to call it in question from a real error of the understanding.

"4. Among us, many people may, from intolerable languor, be tempted to work on Sunday, especially where refinement in doctrine represents amusements and social meetings as profanations of that day. But this could not be the case by the Mosaic regulation, according to which, the Sabbath was at the same time a day on which amusements and feasts were authorized.

"All this, however, would perhaps be still unsatisfactory, had every work on the Sabbath, undertaken from the mere love of gain, been punishable with death. I do not, however, believe that this was really the case here, but am of opinion that the penal law relative to the profanation of the Sabbath should be understood in no other sense than the other laws are, to the class whereof it belongs; that is, only of its presumptuous profanation in defiance of the law. Had any one, out of avarice, worked privately in his own house, it could not possibly be said that he had transgressed the law of the Sabbath *with a high hand*; particularly when we consider that this expression, in Hebrew, includes in other places the idea of what is *public* and *unconcealed* (Exod. xiv. 8). In fact, it were quite sufficient to observe that Moses makes this restriction with respect to the whole class of capital crimes against the ceremonial law; but it is to be remarked, besides, that the principal passage in which the punishment of the Sabbath-breaker is fixed (Numb. xv. 32–36) immediately follows these words,—'Whoever, whether native or stranger, presumptuously transgresseth the law, despiseth Jehovah, and shall be extirpated from among his people; for he hath despised the word of Jehovah, and broken his commandment. Such a man shall be extirpated, and to no one but himself impute thou this.' (Ver. 30, 31.) And when we are informed immediately after, that the Israelites had discovered a man collecting wood on the Sabbath-day, &c. &c. we cannot but think the story expressly introduced in illustration of the preceding law.

"The example just mentioned is, at the same time, the only instance in the whole of the Old Testament of the infliction of capital punishment on account of a breach of the Sabbath. Considering, then, that we find the prophets frequently preaching against this crime, which of course was not a rare one, we must conclude that the punishment of death only attended it when aggravated by its publicity, or some other circumstance, which made it amount to absolute presumption, and perhaps to wilful renouncement of God, in honour of whom the Sabbath was solemnized." (Art. 249; vol. iv. pp. 39, 43–47.)

Preaching on the Sabbath not a Mosaic Institution.—"The Levites were not merely a spiritualty, but *literati of all the faculties*, and

by birth obliged to devote themselves to the sciences, for the cultivation of which they were so liberally rewarded. Their institution was wholly Egyptian in its origin. The three orders of the priesthood in that country had partitioned literature among themselves, and were particularly engaged in the culture of philosophy, theology, natural history, mathematics, jurisprudence, and history; and the lowest class of them in medicine. Here, too, the priesthood, thus bound to the service of science, was hereditary; whence flowed this advantage, that from their earliest infancy they were introduced to scientific pursuits, and obtained an education suitable to the line in which they were destined to act. . . . .

"We nowhere find that Moses mentions, even *en passant*, any such profession as that of our clergyman, or that he instituted preaching on the Sabbath. The circumstance of the priests and Levites having their abode fixed in forty-eight distinct cities of their own, altogether incapacitated them from performing the duties of the clergy in regard to religious instruction, and what we call *the cure of souls*; for what more absurd could be imagined than our having cities in which several hundred preachers dwelt together, while not one lived in our other cities, or was dispersed through the country? . . . .

"The Levites, therefore, cannot be justly compared with our preachers. This class of men, whose importance in a political point of view alone must be acknowledged, if they did nothing else than instruct the common people in morality, was wanting in the constitution of the Mosaic state and church; so, likewise, the priests of the gods in other nations were occupied, not in instruction, but in sacrifices and ceremonies. A body of *doctors*, properly so called, did not exist among the Jews until after the Babylonish captivity, when the pressing emergencies of the church required its establishment; as the people, from the change of their languages and manners, could no longer understand their ancient law without the aid of expounders. It was at this period that teachers first began to be introduced; but they were not necessarily taken from any particular tribe.

"With all this, however, the Levites were in so far ministers of religion, as they performed holy ceremonies, copied the law, and, in doubtful cases, explained it. To them the original of the law was committed (Deut. xxxi. 9); they were to be its guardians, and take care to make correct transcripts of it. Printing was yet for many ages unknown; and an order of learned clerks (*Clerici*), that is, of *scribes*, was very necessary for the preservation of books. The king had to take his copy of the law from theirs (Deut. xvii. 18). They were bound, at the end of every seven years, to read over the law in the hearing of all the people (Deut. xxxi. 10–13); and even to be so conversant in it that they could, at least when questioned, give instructions concerning religion. In so far, therefore, were they a Spirituality, and, exactly according to the ideas of the middle ages, *Clerks*, that is, people who could handle the pen, and transcribed books of importance." (Art. 52; vol. i. pp. 255–7.)

284. HALL, ARCHIBALD.—Gospel Worship, vol. ii. chap. 10. Edin. 1770.

285. JORTIN, JOHN, D.D., *Archdeacon of London, and Rector of St Dunstan's in the East* (*born* 1698; *died* 1770).—Sermons on Different Subjects. Lond. 1772. 6 vols. 8vo.

Vol. V. contains two sermons on the Sabbath (pp. 65–109), which are reprinted in his *Works*, vol. ix. pp. 106–133; Lond. 1810.

The opinions of this learned, able, and liberal divine respecting it are similar to those of Le Clerc (above, p. 111).

"It must be acknowledged," says he, "that the commandment concerning the Sabbath seems to require nothing more than a strict and solemn rest from labour; and even thus interpreted, it was a wise and merciful law, intended partly for the benefit and refreshment of slaves, whose condition was in all nations and in all times hard and wretched. But they who consecrated the Sabbath to acts of religion must be allowed to have sanctified it in a more excellent sense than if they had only abstained from labour." (P. 67.)

In a note, he thus comments on a passage in Josephus (quoted above, i. 116), where that historian affirms that Moses commanded the Jews to assemble on the Sabbath-day for the purpose of hearing the Law:—

"The misfortune is, that when we seek for this precept we cannot find it. One way to bring Josephus off is to suppose that ἐκέλευσε only means, *he permitted*. So Mr Whiston boldly translates it; but this interpretation cannot be admitted; and the following words, ὃ δὴ πάντες οἱ νομοθέται ἐοίκασι παραλιπεῖν, confute it.

"Another thing to be said for Josephus is, that he founded his opinion on Levit. xxiii. 2,—

"'Concerning the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, even these are my feasts. Six days shall work be done, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, an holy convocation.'

"But though it should be granted that by an holy convocation may be meant an assembly held for the performance of religious acts, yet here is no command to read the Law, or to hear it read.

"Lastly; It may be alleged that Moses says,—'These words which I command thee this day shall be in thy heart, and thou shalt teach them, &c., and talk of them continually, and at all times.' (Deut. vi. 6.)

"If at all times, certainly and more especially on the Sabbath-days, and at the holy convocations.

"This seems to be a fair inference; but it amounts not to a positive command.

"Philo* agrees with Josephus, saying—Ἑβδόμαις ἡμέραις αὐτὰς

* See above, vol. i. p. 118.

εἰς ταυτὸν ἠξίουν συνάγεσθαι, καὶ καθιζομένους μετ' ἀλλήλων—τῶν νόμων ἀκροᾶσθαι.—Apud Eusebium, *Præp. Evang.* viii. 359." (P. 67.)

Dr Jortin reviews the doctrine and practice of Jesus about the Sabbath, and on this subject concludes as follows:—

"From the things which have been said we may learn, that the contest between our Lord and the Jews was not whether the Sabbath should be kept holy and spent in the service of God; for that duty he exactly observed. His disciples also did not imagine themselves released from keeping the Sabbath, or even from resting strictly on it, when they had no work of necessity or charity to hinder them. They did not, I say, think themselves released from this law, at the time of His death, by anything that He had said upon the subject. The women who had attended Him to His grave prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath-day, according to the commandment.

"The dispute, then, between Christ and the Jews was, whether it were lawful to do works of mercy and necessity on that day; which they denied, and He affirmed and proved.

"It is worthy of observation that our Lord explains ritual and moral laws in a very different manner,—in the former allowing a favourable latitude,—in the latter requiring great exactness.

"What He taught concerning the Sabbath amounts to this: Ye have heard it said, thou shalt do no manner of work on the seventh day; but I say unto you that this prohibition was not intended to be so rigorous as to admit no exception, and that what is necessary for the preservation of life and health, what justice and mercy and charity require, is not to be deemed a breach of that law.

"But when He explains moral laws, it is thus: Ye have heard that it was said, thou shalt not kill; but I say unto you, ye shall not be angry without a cause. Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt not forswear thyself; but I say unto you, that in your conversation ye shall not swear at all. Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbour; but I say unto you, that by the word, neighbour, is to be understood every man, even a stranger, even an enemy." (Pp. 85-87.)

In the second sermon, Dr Jortin proceeds to inquire to what extent the law of the Sabbath concerns Christians. On the ground of its utility as a stated day for worship and religious instruction, he thinks them bound to observe a weekly day of rest; and while, on the one hand, we are taught by Paul that the obligation to keep the Jewish Sabbath had ceased, on the other hand "it appears from some passages in the New Testament, and from other ancient writings, that the disciples and their converts agreed to set apart for public worship the first day of the week, the day of Christ's resurrection, which was also the day on which he sent down the Holy Ghost upon his Apostles. By setting aside the Lord's Day for the solemn worship of God, they observed all that was moral in the Fourth Commandment, namely, a stated time for religious exercises; and they thought it proper to retain the same portion of time, one day in seven." (P. 93.) And "the example of the

first believers, in this as in some other things, is worthy of our respect and imitation." (P. 99.)

"If it be true," he observes, "that God sent his Son to give us laws, by which we should regulate our lives, and by which we shall be judged, it is equally true that we ought not to omit any opportunities of frequenting those assemblies where the divine precepts are taught by those who are appointed to that office, that so we may be instructed in those things on which our eternal happiness depends. This argument will reach the greater part of Christians, who stand in need of such instruction, that they may acquire right notions of morality and of Christianity, and a due sense of their importance. Our duty is indeed easy to be known, —so far easy, that it requires neither much learning, nor hard study, nor great abilities. A tolerable understanding and an honest mind will suffice to attain all necessary knowledge: but some diligence and application is needful, and an use of the means which are afforded to us; we must worship God in private and in public, and read the Scriptures, and hear them explained.

"If it be true that we are weak and frail creatures, disposed to be led astray by temptations, to be taken up with the things of this world, and to forget what relates to the next, sometimes persisting in a behaviour which we cannot approve, and sometimes treacherously deluding ourselves, it is equally true that we want to be reminded of those things from which we turn away our thoughts, to be excited to those duties which we know better than we practise, and to be continually exhorted, lest we be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. Upon this account, religious assemblies are absolutely necessary, where are set before us the obligations to live righteously, and the advantages of such a life, the pernicious nature and fatal consequences of sin—truths which the wisest and the best person in the world wants frequently to hear, plain and obvious as they are, and truths which every person ought to hear with attention and respect, how imperfect soever be our discourses upon them. Such is the dignity of the subject, that we must sink beneath it; but such is its usefulness and importance, that it is scarcely possible to treat it seriously without saying something that must have a good effect upon a well-disposed mind.

"If it be true that our meeting together at stated times for the solemn worship of God hath a plain tendency to make us live in the fear of God,—to make us useful in our several stations,—it follows that this is a duty to which we are bound, even for the sake of others. . . . .

"Lastly, There is no duty more frequently inculcated in the Gospel than benevolence, brotherly love, and charity. Upon this our Lord insists with a particular earnestness: by this, He says, it should be known who are His disciples; thereby disowning all those who will not comply with it. Now there is nothing which seems more proper to promote and preserve union and friendship amongst Christians than the public worship of God.

"We find in the histories of Greece and Rome that lawgivers and founders of governments, projecting to unite men collected perhaps from different nations, and to make them live as friends in one commonwealth, thought this to be the best expedient, to institute sacred rites and ceremonies which the people should observe, and to appoint stated assemblies, where, after certain religious solemnities, they were to partake of a common feast. It was supposed that this would unite the minds and affections of the people, would produce concord in time of peace, and would make them afraid and ashamed in time of war to act dishonourably and to forsake each other.

"Whatsoever good effects might be expected, or did proceed from such political institutions, may with more reason be presumed to be the natural consequence of the public worship of God amongst Christians. As to the improvement of the heart, it is extremely manifest on which side the advantage lies. In the religious assemblies and ceremonies of the Pagans, religion, that is, piety and devotion, was the least part, and all was usually transacted in such a manner that it was rather amusing than edifying. When we are assembled to appear before our Maker, nothing is wanting that is proper to inspire great and good sentiments, to exclude the frivolous cares and concerns of this life, and to raise the mind to heaven; all worldly distinctions cease, and we come as fellow-servants of the same God; we praise Him for the common benefits which we receive from Him; we pray to Him, not for ourselves singly, but in general for all men, in particular for our brethren in the faith; we desire Him to receive us hereafter into that kingdom where dwell peace and concord; we hear those divine precepts which we ought all to obey, and by which we must all be judged; and, in partaking of the Lord's supper, we eat and drink together at the same table, as being all of Christ's family, and belonging to the same Master, who loved us with an equal and impartial love, and offers us the same promises and the same privileges." (Pp. 101–3, 104–7.)

On the whole question, How Christians should regard and observe the Lord's Day, he concludes as follows:—

"We should reject all those notions which superstition and a zeal for trifles suggest, and take care not to oppress our minds with frivolous scruples, which may prove a great disturbance to us, whether we observe or whether we neglect them.

"We should be very cautious not to overvalue our observance of the Lord's Day—not to think too well of ourselves upon that account. When we have done all this, and more than this, we are but unprofitable servants. Much more should we beware of that foolish and illusive imagination, that a regular attendance on public worship and a decent behaviour at it will atone for habitual sins, and that if we give a seventh part of our time to God, we may give the other six to folly and iniquity.

"Setting aside such weak and deceitful notions, we should show that respect to the Lord's Day, and employ it in that manner

which ancient custom, and the laws of our own country, and the practice of sober and virtuous persons, and the rules of decency, and the duty of setting a good example, and the care of our own souls, require from us." (Pp. 108–9.)

286. ORR, JOHN, *Archdeacon of Ferns.*—Sermons, vol. i. p. 328. Lond. 1772. 8vo.

287. DE COETLOGON, CHARLES, M.A., *Rector of Godstone, Surrey* (*died* 1820).—The Nature, Necessity, and Advantage of the Religious Observation of the Lord's Day, illustrated and enforced in a Sermon preached for the Encouragement of a Society uniting for the Suppression of the Profanation of the Lord's Day. Lond. 1776. 8vo. Pp. 40.

Appended is a Brief Account of the Society referred to, from which the following passages are taken:—

"A number of tradesmen and others, who were much concerned to see the laws of God and this nation most irreligiously and contemptuously violated, by persons exercising their ordinary trades and callings on the Lord's Day; and conceiving that these evils might be remedied, both for the benefit of the industrious poor, and greatly to the reputation and honour of a country professing Christianity; about Michaelmas, 1775, formed themselves into a society, in order to put into execution the several statutes now in force, for the due observation of the Lord's Day, particularly an act made in the twenty-ninth year of the reign of King Charles the Second. . . . .

"At every weekly meeting, the President nominates as many members as the society shall judge sufficient (to be taken as their names stand on the list), to attend the succeeding Sunday morning, by eight o'clock, or sooner, if necessary, in order to proceed to such places as may appear needful.

"The persons so appointed, at the next meeting of the society, lay before the members, for their consideration, such offences as come within their cognizance, that such offenders may be proceeded against as the law directs."

The Act referred to, 29 Cha. II. c. 7, enacts (sect. 1) that "all persons whatsoever shall, on every Lord's Day, apply themselves to the observation of the same, by exercising themselves thereon in the duties of piety and true religion, publicly and privately;" and that "no tradesman, artificer, workman, labourer, or other person whatsoever, shall do or exercise any worldly labour, business or work of their ordinary callings upon the Lord's Day (works of necessity and charity only excepted)," under a penalty of 5s.; and it prohibits the public sale and hawking of wares and goods. Sect.

2 prohibits drovers, horse-coursers, waggoners, butchers, higglers, and their servants, from travelling; and the use of boats, wherries, lighters, or barges, except on extraordinary occasions. By sect. 3, the dressing of meat in families, the dressing and selling it in inns, cook-shops, or victualling-houses, and crying milk before nine and after four, are excepted from the operation of the Act. By sect. 6, persons are prohibited from serving or executing any process, warrant, &c. on the Lord's Day, except in cases of treason, felony, or breach of the peace.

288. CARRINGTON, JAMES, *senior*, M.A., *Chancellor of Exeter*.—Sermons on the following subjects:—The Duty of Keeping Holy the Sabbath-day, &c. Lond. 1776.

289. DE COURCY, RICHARD, *Vicar of St Alkmond's Parish, Shrewsbury (died* 1803).—Hints respecting the utility of some Parochial Plan for suppressing the Profanation of the Lord's Day. Shrewsb. 1777.

290. An Enquiry into the Design of the Christian Sabbath, and the manner in which it should be observed, to answer its important end. Lond. 1779.

291. An Act for preventing certain Abuses and Profanations on the Lord's Day, called Sunday. (21 Geo. III. c. 49.) Lond. 1781.

This Act begins as follows: "Whereas certain houses, rooms, or places, within the cities of London or Westminster, or in the neighbourhood thereof, have of late frequently been opened for public entertainment or amusement upon the evening of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday; and at other houses, rooms, or places, within the said cities, or in the neighbourhood thereof, under pretence of inquiring into religious doctrines, and explaining texts of holy Scripture, debates have frequently been held on the evening of the Lord's Day, concerning divers texts of holy Scripture, by persons unlearned and incompetent to explain the same, to the corruption of good morals, and to the great encouragement of irreligion and profaneness; be it enacted, &c., That, from and after the passing of this present Act, any house, room, or other place, which shall be opened or used for public entertainment or amusement, or for publicly debating on any subject whatsoever, upon any part of the Lord's Day, called Sunday, and to which persons shall be admitted by the payment of money, or by tickets sold for money, shall be deemed a disorderly house or place; and the keeper of such house, &c., shall forfeit the sum of L.200

for every day that such house, &c., shall be opened or used as aforesaid on the Lord's Day, to such person as will sue for the same, and be otherwise punishable as the law directs in cases of disorderly houses." Managers of the entertainments or amusements, masters of ceremonies, presidents of meetings, &c., shall forfeit L.100 for each offence; and doorkeepers, &c. L.50. Sect. 2, The person who acts as master or mistress shall be deemed the owner. All houses where refreshments are sold at greater prices on Sundays than on other days, and such as shall be opened for public debate on Sundays by subscription, &c., shall be liable to the penalties. Sect. 3, Any person advertising or causing to be advertised, or publishing an advertisement of any public entertainment or amusement, or any public meeting for debating on any subject whatever on the Lord's Day, to which persons are to be admitted by the payment of money or by tickets sold for money, shall forfeit L.50 for every such offence. Sect. 5, Actions must be brought within six months. Sects. 7 and 8, The Act not to affect ecclesiastical jurisdiction, nor the Toleration Act of 1 Will. and Mary.

The chief promoter of this Act was Dr Beilby Porteus, then Bishop of Chester, among whose papers the following statement was found by his biographer:—

"The beginning of the winter of 1780 was distinguished by the rise of a new species of dissipation and profaneness. A set of needy and profligate adventurers, finding every day and almost every hour of the week occupied by some amusement or other, bethought themselves of trying what might be done on a Sunday. It was a novel and a bold attempt, but not the less likely to succeed in this country and in these times. They therefore opened and publicly advertised two different sorts of entertainment for the Sunday evening. One of these was at Carlisle House, and was called a Promenade. The other was a meeting at public rooms hired for the purpose, and assumed the name of *Christian Societies*, *Religious Societies*, *Theological Societies*, *Theological Academies*, &c. The *professed* design of the former was merely to walk about and converse, and take refreshments, the price of admission being three shillings; but the *real consequence*, and probably the *real purpose* of it, was to draw together dissolute people of both sexes, and to make the Promenade a place of assignation; and, in fact, it was a collection of the lowest and most profligate characters that could possibly be assembled together from every part of London. It gave offence, not only to every man of gravity and seriousness, but even to young men of gaiety and freedom, several of whom I have heard speak of it with abhorrence. Nay, even foreigners were shocked and scandalized at it, considering it a disgrace to any Christian country to tolerate so gross an insult on all decency and good order.

"The business, or, as it should be rather called, the *amusement*, proposed at the Sunday Debating Societies, was to discuss passages

of Scripture, which were selected and given out for that purpose; when every one present, ladies as well as gentlemen, were to propose their doubts, receive explanations, and display their eloquence on the text proposed. It was to be, in short, a school for Metaphysics, Ethics, Pulpit Oratory, Church History, and Canon Law. It is easy to conceive what infinite mischief such debates as these must do to the younger part of the community, who, being unemployed on this day, would flock to any assembly of this sort; would look upon every doubt and difficulty started there as an unanswerable argument against religion, and would go home absolute sceptics, if not confirmed unbelievers. Thus, as the Promenade tended to destroy every moral sentiment, the Theological Assemblies were calculated to extinguish every religious principle; and both together threatened the worst consequences to public morals.

"It was therefore highly necessary to put a speedy and effectual stop to such alarming evils. I mentioned it early in the winter to several persons of rank and authority, and waited a considerable time in the hope that some one of more weight and influence than myself would have stood forth on this occasion. But the Session being now far advanced, and finding no one inclined to take the matter up, it became absolutely necessary to do something, and I therefore resolved to try what my own exertions would do. I first consulted several eminent lawyers, as well as the principal acting magistrates in Westminster, in order to know whether either the statute or the common law, *as they now stood*, was sufficient to check this evil. They all assured me that both were insufficient, and that nothing but an Act of Parliament, framed on purpose, could effectually suppress it. In consequence of this opinion I applied to a legal friend, and with his assistance got a proper Bill sketched out, which I afterwards shewed to Lord Bathurst, President of the Council, and to Sir John Skinner, Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer; and it was afterwards communicated to the Lord Chancellor Thurlow, and Lord Mansfield. After it had received their approbation, I applied to the Solicitor-General, Mr Mansfield, who undertook to move it in the House of Commons; and Sir William Dolben agreed to second it. This they did on the 3d of May 1781, and the Bill was intitled, 'An Act for preventing certain Abuses and Profanations on the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.' It was violently opposed in its different stages through the House by several members, particularly Mr Wilkes; but it passed without a division. On the second reading of the Bill in the House of Lords, it was opposed principally by the Duke of Manchester, who thought that there were not sufficient proofs of the mischievous tendency of the Sunday evening amusements. 'The subjects of this kingdom,' he said, 'should be left at perfect liberty to confer upon religious subjects without control; and he did not believe that there was anything improper either in the Promenade or the Societies. In his apprehension they were perfectly innocent; but, even if the fact were otherwise, there were laws already in force sufficient to restrain them, and there was no

necessity to add to the number of our penal statutes, already sufficiently numerous.'

"In answer to this, I observed, that although there was no evidence at the bar to prove the allegations of the preamble, which in a public Bill, and in a matter of such notoriety, I conceived was seldom, if ever required; yet there were the very best grounds for believing the pernicious tendency of the Sunday evening amusements to be much greater than the preamble stated. I had conversed with many persons, who had themselves been present in these places, and was perfectly satisfied that they were highly dangerous in every point of view. But, even without entering into their interior constitution and consequences, I could not but think that the very external appearance of them on the Lord's Day, was an offence against common decency, and the most ancient and venerable customs of this country. They were places of public amusement opened on a Sunday. They were publicly advertised; were in a public room; money was publicly taken at the door, and that for the avowed purpose of public amusement. This, I apprehended, was the very definition of a public diversion; and it was notorious that public diversions had never been permitted by the laws of the land in this kingdom, from the time of the Reformation to the present moment, and I hoped they never would. In Popish countries they were indeed permitted, though even there they were condemned by many serious men; for a friend of mine, Dr Lort, in the year 1768, saw an injunction or admonition of the Archbishop of Mechlin, in one of the towns under his jurisdiction, in which he complained heavily of the liberties taken by the people on Sundays, and spoke in high terms of the conduct of the heretics, that is, the Protestants, in that respect. But, however these indulgences might suit the spirit of Popery, they did not accord with the temper of Protestantism. They were contrary to the spirit of our constitution; contrary to the spirit of our laws and our religion. They were new invasions of the sanctity of the Lord's Day, and had never been heard of in this country till within these few years. The different method of observing Sunday in England and in foreign countries, was one great mark of distinction between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, and it was a distinction which I hoped never to see abolished. It was not my wish to go to the Church of Rome to know in what manner Sunday ought to be observed in England. I was therefore for resisting these dangerous innovations in the very beginning. If they were not crushed at their very outset, it was impossible to say how far they might go. If the Legislature suffered them to pass at first without notice, their Lordships must not imagine the mischief would stop where it now is. The places of entertainment lately opened for the Sunday evening were only the beginnings of a regular plan to introduce *Sunday diversions* into this kingdom; they were only trials and experiments to *feel the way*, and to see how the Government will bear such violations of decency; and if the proprietors of these places find that they are perfectly secure, they will very soon take

care to have fresh amusements for every hour of the Sunday, even for those which ought to be spent in the celebration of divine worship. Unless therefore their Lordships were prepared to say, that public diversions ought to be allowed in this country, they must resist this artful attempt to introduce them under the specious name of a Promenade, and the sacred plea of religion.

"It has been said, indeed, that this Bill is a restraint upon religious liberty. It is no such thing. It restrains no one from professing that mode of religion, and joining in that form of public worship which his conscience best approves. It restrains no one from speaking, conversing, or writing upon religious subjects. It imposes no other restraint than this, which is surely no very great hardship, that *no one shall either pay or be paid for talking blasphemy or profaneness in a public room on the Lord's Day.* It takes away, in short, no other liberty but the liberty of burlesquing Scripture, and making religion a public amusement, and a public trade, which I was inclined to think their Lordships would not consider essential marks of religious freedom." (*Life*, prefixed to his Works, by the Rev. Robert Hodgson, pp. 71–82.)

The debates in the two Houses on this Bill are recorded in the *Parliamentary History*, vol. xxii. pp. 262–290. Mr Martin, one of those who spoke against it in the Lower House, said, "he was very much for keeping strictly the Sabbath in regard to refraining from our ordinary occupations, but he never could see any prohibition from amusement even in the Fourth Commandment; and if we could have any innocent amusements that might be promoted without the labour of others, he should think them perfectly consistent with the proper observation of the Sabbath, and tending greatly to promote that temper of mind which incites gratitude to our Maker, and benevolence to mankind." And "he hoped they would permit the middling and lower ranks of people, as well as the great and learned, to exercise the undoubted privilege of reasonable creatures, that of inquiring into, and accepting or rejecting, any doctrines, as they appear reasonable or unreasonable to the understanding which God has given them. But if it should unfortunately pass, a gentleman whose opinion he had heard, had said that the Act should run in this manner:—'And it is hereby enacted that all his Majesty's subjects shall be permitted to exercise their reason, and use the utmost freedom of inquiry into religious opinions, and that for six of the days in the week; but on the seventh, which is called Sunday, their understandings shall be in a state of rest. And it is farther enacted, that six months' imprisonment and a fine of L.20 shall be levied on every man who shall profane the Sunday by exercising those rational faculties with which God has endowed him.'" (Pp. 274–5.)

In the House of Lords, the Earl of Abingdon, in reply to Bishop Porteus, observed:—"The rev. Prelate said, that in Roman Catholic countries, plays, operas, and other pastimes were admitted on a Sunday; but in Protestant countries they were not. But for what reason are they not to be admitted in Protestant countries? Does

the rev. Prelate know the wisdom and policy of that measure? Does he not know that the fundamental object of all government is, or ought to be, that the people of that government should be rightly employed? How much better is it, therefore, that people should be suffered to come together of a Sunday evening under the eye and policy of their government, to be amused by entertainments in which there is no moral turpitude, than to be left to go a-whoring after their own imaginations, and in the commission of acts which are not only *contra bonos mores*, but which neither the eye nor policy of any government can remedy or prevent. Another thing the rev. Prelate said was, that he had the highest law authorities to assert that there was no law in force to prevent that which this Act meant to provide against. Can there be a more decided argument against this Bill? Will any law authority say, will his Majesty's Solicitor-General say, if these were disorderly meetings, if anything occurred at them which was contrary to the peace and good order of society, that there are not laws in being, and laws in abundance too, in every respect sufficient, not only to punish the offence, but to remedy the evil? What does the Bill itself say? It says, that the ecclesiastical courts have themselves power to punish these offences, and provides that this jurisdiction should not be altered or abridged by the passing of this Bill. What then is the obvious purpose of this Bill? It is to make that a crime which is at present neither *malum prohibitum* nor *malum in se*, and to furnish punishments for offences, for which, if offences, it is admitted punishments are already to be had." His Lordship farther proposed, that were the Bill to be passed at all, it ought to be made applicable to *every* day of the week; seeing that, if debates held on the evening of the Lord's Day did (as described in the preamble) really promote the corruption of good morals, and give encouragement to irreligion and profaneness, debates of the same description, held on any other evening, must necessarily produce the same effect. He added, that "these profaners, determined upon their profanations, and to evade this Act, have already agreed upon Monday instead of Sunday evening to hold their future meetings; and therefore, my Lords, that we may not be outwitted by these sinners, I hold it best that we should prevent them at once, and by this Bill, from debating upon any subject whatsoever, upon any day whatsoever." (Pp. 286-8.)

By the comprehensiveness of its enactments and the severity of its penalties, the statute was at once effectual. It is now the barrier which prevents the admission of the public on Sundays to the Crystal Palace at Sydenham—an institution very different in its character and tendencies from those which inflamed the zeal of Bishop Porteus.

292. KNOX, VICESIMUS, D.D., *Master of Tunbridge School* (*born* 1752; *died* 1821).—Essays, Moral and Literary. Lond. 1777.

The 20th essay is "On the Amusements of Sunday," and must have appeared originally in an edition published after the passing of the Act of 1781, to which it refers. The author observes:—

"The institution of a day devoted to rest and reflection, after six days spent in labour and dissipation, is not only wise in a political and religious view, but highly agreeable to the nature of man. The human mind is so constituted by nature, as to make greater advances by short flights frequently repeated, than by uninterrupted progression. After the cessation of a whole day, the operations of the week are begun with fresh ardour, and acquire a degree of novelty—a quality which possesses a most powerful effect in stimulating to application. In truth, no time is lost to the public by the observation of a Sabbath; for the loss of a few hours is amply compensated by the additional vigour and spirit which are given to human activity by the agreeable vicissitude. A thousand reasons might be assigned for the observation of it, supposing it wanted any, superadded to the sanction of divine authority. Among others, the long duration of this establishment is, in my opinion, an argument greatly in its favour; for human affairs, in a long course of years, settle, for the most part, like water, in their proper level and situation.

"It may, then, be numbered among the follies of modern innovators, and pretenders to superior enlargement of mind and freedom from prejudice, that they have endeavoured to destroy the sanctity, and, in course, the essential purposes, of this sacred institution. They have laboured to render it a day of public and pleasurable diversion; and, if they had succeeded, they would have made Sunday in no respect different from the other days of the week; for if one man was allowed to pursue pleasure at the usual public places, another, who felt the influence of avarice more than the love of pleasure, would justly have claimed a right to pursue his lucrative labour. And, indeed, it must be owned that there would be far less harm in prosecuting the designs of honest industry than in relaxing the nerves of the mind by a dissolute pursuit of nominal pleasures—of such pleasures as usually terminate in pain, disease, and ruin. The national spirit and strength must be impaired by national corruption. . . . .

"But, setting aside both religious and political arguments, or allowing them all their force, still it will be urged by great numbers, and those too in the higher spheres of life, that all business being prohibited on Sundays, they are really at a loss to spend their time. 'Let us then,' say they, 'since we are forbidden to work, let us play. Let us have public diversions. There can be no harm in a polite promenade. Indeed,' they insist, 'if it were not for the prejudices of the *canaille*, it would be right to permit more places of public diversion on Sundays than on other days, obviously because we have nothing else to do but to attend to them. But English prejudices are too deeply rooted to be eradicated. On the continent, the return of Sunday is delightful;

but in our gloomy island it is a blank in existence, and ought to be blotted out of the calendar.'

"The arguments, indeed, such as they are, were of late presented in the best form, I presume, which they will admit, by one of those noble senators, who opposed the late laudable act for the suppression of some enormities which had been introduced as the pastime of the Sabbath, and whose speech would condemn him to eternal infamy, if its extreme insignificancy did not reverse the sentence, and insure it a friendly and speedy oblivion. . . . .

"If lords and dukes would condescend to go to their parish church, they might find themselves well employed from ten o'clock to twelve. To the prayers they can have no reasonable objection; and, with respect to the sermon, though its diction or its sentiments may not be excellent, yet, in the present times, the want of merit is usually compensated by brevity. And the great man may comfort himself during its continuance with reflecting that, though he is neither pleased nor instructed by it, yet he himself is preaching in effect a most persuasive sermon by giving his attendance. His example will attract many auditors, and bad indeed must be the discourse from which the vulgar hearer cannot derive much advantage. If any charitable purpose is to be accomplished, and there never passes a Sunday but in the metropolis many such purposes are to be accomplished, the bare presence of a man in high life will contribute greatly to the pecuniary collection. And, if a peer of the realm was as willing to give his presence at a charity sermon as at a horse-race, to contribute to the support of orphans and widows as to keep a stud and a pack of hounds, perhaps he would find himself no loser even in the grand object of his life, the enjoyment of pleasure.

"The interval between the morning and evening service may surely be spent in reading, or in improving conversation. The rest of the day, even to eight o'clock, may be spent in the metropolis at church (if any one chooses it), for evening lectures abound. And though there is no obligation to attend at more than the established times, yet no man can say there are no public places of resort, when he can scarcely turn a corner without seeing a church-door open, and hearing a bell importunately inviting him to enter.

"The little time which remains after the usual religious duties of the day may certainly be spent in such a manner as to cause no tedium, even though Carlisle-house is shut, and the rigid laws forbid us to enter Vauxhall, Ranelagh, and the theatres. A cheerful walk amidst rural scenes is capable of affording, in fine weather, a very sensible pleasure. In all seasons, at all hours, and in all weathers, conversation is capable of affording an exquisite delight, —and books, of improving, exalting, refining, and captivating the human mind. He who calls in question the truth of this must allow his hearers to call in question his claim to rationality.

"The subordinate classes, for I have hitherto been speaking of the higher, seldom complain that they know not what to do on a Sunday. To them it is a joyful festival. They, for the most part,

are constant attendants at church; and the decency of their habits and appearance, the cleanliness which they display, the opportunity they enjoy of meeting their neighbours in the same regular and decent situation with themselves, render Sunday highly advantageous to them, exclusively of its religious advantages. They usually fill up the intervals of divine service with a rural walk, and their little indulgences at the tea-houses are highly proper and allowable. They are confined to sedentary and laborious work during the week, and a walk in the fresh air is most conducive to their health, while it affords them a very lively pleasure,—such a pleasure, indeed, as we have all felt in Milton's famous description of it. The common people are sufficiently delighted with such enjoyments, and would really be displeased with those public diversions which our travelled reformers have desired to introduce.

"Neither are they in want of disputing societies to fill up their time. There are parish churches in abundance. After they have attended at them, it is far better that they should walk in the air than be pent up in a close room and putrifying air, where their health must suffer more than even in the exercise of their handicraft, trade, or vocation. But that indeed is one of the least of the evils which they must endure, were they allowed to attend at every turbulent assembly, which either the avaricious or the discontented may convene. Weak understandings are easily led astray by weak arguments. Their own morals and happiness, and the welfare of the church and state, are greatly interested in the suppression of those houses which were lately opened under the arrogant name of the theological schools. The act which suppressed them reflects honour on the British senate."

The evil and adulterous generation which Dr Knox advised to go to church admired his elegant sentences, but only smiled at his advice. As for the Act, we learn from the *New Annual Register* for 1781, p. 147, that many even of the true friends of religion looked on it as arbitrary, partial, and unwise.

293. KENNICOTT, BENJAMIN, D.D. (*see* No. 264.)—The Sabbath: A Sermon preached in His Majesty's Chapel, Whitehall, and before the University of Oxford. Oxford, 1781. 8vo. Pp. 47.

Dr Kennicott here argues, in a more declamatory style than in his *Dissertations* (above, p. 202), that the Sabbath was instituted at the creation, and its observance is therefore a duty of all men for ever.

"If, indeed," he admits, "the observation of a Sabbath had been nowhere commanded but in the 20th chapter of Exodus, and had we no notice of its having been at all observed till after the Fourth Commandment had been delivered to the Jews, then the obligation on us Christians would not have been so clear and so conclusive as it is at present. But the case, in fact, is otherwise." (P. 12.)

"And now," he proceeds, "on viewing the subject in this light

we cease to wonder that we have no such command from Christ or his Apostles, because there was no occasion for it,—God having, at the creation, enjoined a Sabbath to all mankind, consequently to us Christians. But, as to the particular day, let this remark be carefully attended to (and, for want of attending to it, many and unhappy have been the differences amongst Christians), that, though one particular nation, in one particular country, may observe one and the same day in the week, yet all nations upon earth cannot observe one and the same day. And the reason is, because it is not the same day to all nations at the same time. In some countries the sun rises when it sets in others. With other inhabitants of this round world, it is midnight, at an hour when with us it is noonday. What therefore is our Sabbath-day cannot possibly be theirs, nor can our day be their day at all, because our day is their night.

"It being therefore impossible that any holy day can be celebrated at one and the same time by all men, though it may by the inhabitants of a single country, it follows that, though one and the same day might be commanded, and was observed in Judea, it could not be observed, and of course was not commanded, universally. Thus we see that the Jews, when in Palestine, might observe, as their Sabbath, what is nearly our Saturday; but that all men cannot observe our Sunday. So that, as the former were fixed to one particular day in seven, the latter could only be fixed to some one day in seven,—to that day which was nearest to the seventh,—or to some one day which God had distinguishingly honoured,—such as was the day of that universal blessing, the resurrection of Jesus Christ." (Pp. 17, 18.)

The distinction thus drawn between the Jewish and Christian Sabbath-days will hardly satisfy those who consider that the day began and ended at different times to Jews living in different parts of Palestine itself, and much more to Jews in places so distant from it and from each other as Rome and Babylon, where the Sabbath-law was no less binding than at home. Their duty *everywhere* appears to have simply been to observe *the seventh day of the week*, without caring whether it precisely coincided with the same day in other longitudes and latitudes; and surely such a duty is as practicable to Christians as to Jews. So, evidently, thought the Westminster Assembly, when they taught in their *Catechism* that "from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, God appointed the seventh day of the week to be the weekly Sabbath; and the first day of the week ever since, to continue to the end of the world, which is the Christian Sabbath." We may thus see great reason to doubt the soundness of Dr Kennicott's opinion, that the words in the Fourth Commandment, "the seventh day is the Sabbath," "*can only mean one day in seven, or every seventh day.*" (P. 19.) If they can mean this, they can equally mean what the Jews have always and everywhere understood them to mean—*the seventh day of the week*. If such *is* their meaning, his inference, unless otherwise maintainable, falls to the

ground,—that "we Christians may, consistently with reason and holy Scripture, unite in that solemn petition subjoined in our Liturgy to the Fourth Commandment, and devoutly pray that God would incline *our* hearts to keep that law."

Dr Kennicott reiterates his opinion that the patriarchal Sabbath-day was Sunday, which was changed to Saturday at the exodus, and restored at the resurrection of Jesus.

His assertion on p. 21, that the primitive Christians "made a religious use of the whole day, and never thought of compounding the matter, like many modern Christians—consecrating one part of the day, and profaning all the rest of it,"—appears to be unsupported by anything that has come down to us from those early times; and he makes no attempt to prove it. In an appended Dialogue, entitled "Objections answered, and difficulties solved," he adds, that "little can it be doubted whether the Sabbath was not, after Christ's death, observed by the Apostles on the first day of the week" (p. 32); yet there is no end of doubters and deniers of this proposition among theological writers. (See, for instance, above, i. 158, 177, 203, 223; ii. 12, 35, 53, 55, 111, 146, 155, 199, 200.) The "friend" with whom the dialogue is carried on observes:—"By your definition of a Sabbath, as being rest for the purposes of religion, you remind me of the strange assertion of some writers, who contend that, in the Fourth Commandment, the idea of rest swallows up every other consideration: When it is really obvious to observe, that the rest is chiefly for the sake of the religion, the Commandment beginning thus—'Remember the Sabbath-day, *to keep it holy*.'". (P. 34.) To which some may reply, that in no sense of the word "strange" can it be applied with propriety to an opinion advocated by Hebrew scholars like Spencer, Vitringa, and Le Clerc (see above, ii. 78, 110, 112), and the denial of which is based on so questionable an assumption as that the Hebrew word translated *keep holy* in the Fourth Commandment, must there signify (what it does not always signify in Scripture) something more than *set apart* for a special purpose—the purpose being, in this case, a divinely appointed rest from labour, which rest was consequently a religious rite among the Jews, and as such is still by them regarded.

Here is a notice of one of the practices against which the Act 21 Geo. III., c. 49, was directed:—

"*Author.*— . . . . We have lived to see, on a Sunday, *public places opened, where persons are admitted for money, to entertain themselves and one another with burlesque upon religion and ridicule of the holy Scriptures;* to see advertised a museum, as admitting customers on a Sunday; to see advertised a newspaper for Sunday; and to see labourers, with their carts and waggons, travelling on this day (like their betters in coaches) in open defiance of the laws of our country!

"*Friend.*—I have heard that Lord Chancellor Harcourt, travelling on a Sunday through Abingdon, in time of divine service, was stopped by the constables; by whom an humble apology was

made to his Lordship for doing what they understood to be their duty. In consequence of which his Lordship ordered his coach to the church-door, and joined in the public worship till the conclusion of it.

"*Author.*— The anecdote does honour to his Lordship's compliance, as well as to the vigilance of the officers who were guarding the observance of this day. But little can be done for religion without guardians much more powerful. And when such will arise, or what will awaken their zeal in a cause so essential to the honour of God and the preservation of religion, is not for you or me to conjecture." (Pp. 39, 40.)

294. GLASSE, SAMUEL, D.D., *Rector of Hanwell, Middlesex.*—A Devout Observance of the Christian Sabbath; a Sermon on Lev. xix. 30. Lond. 1781. 8vo.

295. MOFFAT, Rev. J. M., *of Malmesbury.*—The Protestant's Prayer Book; together with Essays on the Christian Sabbath, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. Bristol, 1783.

296. Animadversions on the present Profanation of the Christian Sabbath; with an earnest Persuasive to persons in authority to attempt the Suppression of that scandalous Abuse. In a letter to the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor of London. By a Minister of a City Parish. Lond. 1783. 8vo.

297. PORTEUS, BEILBY, D.D., *Bishop of Chester, and afterwards of London* (*born* 1731; *died* 1806).—A Sermon on the Sabbath Day, preached before His Majesty. Dublin, 1784.

"It appears," says he, "that our Lord Himself very religiously observed the rest of the Sabbath, which he no otherwise interrupted than by miracles of mercy and compassion. And we may most certainly conclude, that the very same benevolence of disposition which dictated these humane exceptions would prompt him also to improve and enforce, both by his doctrine and example, the general rule of *resting* on the seventh day. For never was there any injunction so replete with kindness and compassion to the whole human race, especially to the lowest and most wretched part of it, as this. There cannot be a more pleasing or a more

consolatory idea presented to the human mind than that of *one universal pause of labour* throughout the whole Christian world at the same moment of time,—diffusing rest, comfort, and peace through a large part of the habitable globe, and affording ease and refreshment, not only to the lowest part of our own species, but to their fellow-labourers in the brute creation. Even these are enabled to join in this silent act of adoration, this mute kind of homage to the great Lord of all; and although they are incapable of any *sentiments* of religion, yet by this means they become sharers in the *blessings* of it. Every man of the least sensibility must see, must feel, the beauty and utility of such an institution as this; and must see, at the same time, the cruelty of invading this most valuable privilege of the inferior class of mankind, and breaking in upon that sacred repose which God Himself has, in pity to their sufferings, given to those that stand most in need of it. . . . . Yet look into the streets of this great metropolis on the Lord's-day, and see whether they convey the idea of *a day of rest*. Do not our servants and our cattle seem to be almost as fully occupied on that day as on any other? And, as if this was not a sufficient infringement of their rights, we contrive, by needless entertainments at home, and needless journeys abroad, which are often *by choice and inclination reserved* for this very day, to take up all the little remaining part of their leisure time. . . . .

"But cessation from labour is not the only duty of the Lord's-day. Although it is to be *a day of rest*, yet it is not to be, what too many seem willing to make it, *a day of indolence and inactivity*. There are employments marked out for it of a very important nature; and of these the first and most essential is the public worship of God."

After some observations on this duty, he proceeds:—

"But supposing our attendance on the house of God to be such as it ought, there still remains a question of no small importance, How are we to employ the remaining part of the Lord's-day? Are we to dedicate it altogether to private devotion and religious meditation, to seclude ourselves from all society, and to assume an affected gloom of countenance and severity of deportment? or may we freely give the reins to our inclination for pleasure, and indulge ourselves without reserve in all the usual gayeties and amusements of the other six days in the week? Both these extremes may be seen among different denominations of Christians in foreign kingdoms; and they have each, at different periods, been adopted in this. At the beginning of the last century, a *Book of Sports and Pastimes* for Sundays was set forth, and recommended to the good people of this land by a prince,* who has been sometimes celebrated for his wisdom, but who in this instance certainly was not wise. It gave great, and, it must be owned, just offence to the rising sect of Puritans, who, in the next reign, thinking it impossible to recede too much from the former profanations of the

* "James the First." [See above, i. 152.]

Lord's-day, ran with too much vehemence into the opposite extreme, and converted the most joyful of all festivals into a day of silent, sullen, austere reserve, and a rigorous abstinence from everything that had the smallest tincture of good humour. When all these extravagancies had subsided, and the constitution, both civil and ecclesiastical, recovered its ancient form, the Church of England, with that wisdom and moderation which have generally governed its decisions, took a middle course with respect to the observation of Sunday. In conformity to ancient statutes and usages, it discouraged all public spectacles and diversions, but allowed the more rational pleasures of society, and the cheerfulness of friendly intercourse and conversation; thus drawing the line, with a discreet and skilful hand, between the two opposite extremes of pharisaical preciseness and secular dissipation. This prudent medium has now for many years been preserved among us; but how much longer it will be preserved seems at present no easy matter to say. The license of the times, however daring in *other* respects, had hitherto spared the day consecrated to our Maker. But it has now carried its outrages even into that once awful sanctuary. In the very midst of all our dangers and distresses, when it did not seem to be *quite* the time for setting Heaven at defiance, new invasions of the Sabbath have sprung up with surprising effrontery; and we are rapidly departing from that simplicity, sobriety, and purity in which this holy festival has been delivered down to us by our ancestors. Various places of amusement for the Sunday evening, unknown to former ages—unknown, I believe, to any other Christian country—have been openly announced, and, to the disgrace of our religion and our laws, have been as openly frequented.

"But how can we wonder at these strange extravagancies in the lower classes of the people, when they only improve a little on the liberties taken by too many of their superiors? If they see magnificent gaming-houses erected, and publicly resorted to on the Lord's-day; if they see that pernicious amusement admitted on the same day even into private families; if they see numerous and splendid assemblies disturbing the repose and violating the sanctity of the Sunday evening; what do we think must be the consequence? Is it not apparent that they will learn from their betters the fatal lesson of insulting the most venerable customs of their country, and the most sacred ordinances of Heaven? that they will soon even *excel* their masters, and carry their contempt of decency far beyond the original examples of it, which made the first impression on their minds?"

The sermon is reprinted in Bishop Porteus's *Works*, vol. ii. p. 201 (Lond. 1836, 8vo). He treats of the Sabbath also in his Lecture on Matthew xii. (vol. iv. p. 283). In another sermon, on Phil. iv. 4, he represents cheerfulness to be a distinguishing feature of the Christian religion (vol. iii. p. 1).

We have already seen how strenuously the Bishop exerted himself in 1781 for the decent observance of the Lord's Day in London;

and we shall afterwards meet him again as a zealous promoter of the same cause.

298. SYMONS, J., B.D.—An Enquiry into the Design of the Christian Sabbath, and the Manner in which it should be observed, to answer its important Ends. 2nd edition. Lond. 1784. 12mo. Pp. 128.

299. BROWN, JOHN, *Minister of the Secession Church of Scotland at Haddington* (*born* 1722; *died* 1787).—Free Thoughts upon the late Regulation of the Post; by which there is an arrival to and departure of the Mail from Edinburgh on the Christian Sabbath: Being the substance of a letter from a Gentleman in the country to his friend in Edinburgh. 1785.

In 1785 the first mail-coach reached Edinburgh from London, and in 1788 it was continued to Glasgow. This tract, by the editor of *The Self-Interpreting Bible*, is a protest against the innovation, as "contrary to the laws both of Church and State; contrary to the law of God; contrary to the most conclusive and constraining reasons assigned by God; and calculated not only to promote the hurt and ruin of the nation, but also the eternal damnation of multitudes." (P. 185 of his *Posthumous Remains*; Perth, 1797. 12mo.)

300. PALEY, WILLIAM, *Archdeacon of Carlisle* (*born* 1743; *died* 1805).—The Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. Lond. 1785. 4to.

Fifteen editions of this celebrated treatise were published during the author's life, and it has often been reprinted since.

Of Book V., which considers our "Duties towards God," the sixth, seventh, and eighth chapters are devoted to the Sabbath. They are as follows:—

"CHAP. VI. *Of the Use of Sabbatical Institutions.*—An assembly cannot be collected unless the time of assembling be fixed and known beforehand; and if the design of the assembly require that it be holden frequently, it is easiest that it should return at stated intervals. This produces a necessity of appropriating set seasons to the social offices of religion. It is also highly convenient that the *same* seasons be observed throughout the country, that all may be employed, or all at leisure, together; for if the recess from worldly occupation be not general, one man's business will perpetually interfere with another man's devotion; the buyer will

be calling at the shop when the seller is gone to church. This part, therefore, of the religious distinction of seasons, namely, a general intermission of labour and business during times previously set apart for the exercise of public worship, is founded in the reasons which make public worship itself a duty. But the celebration of divine service never occupies the whole day. What remains, therefore, of Sunday, beside the part of it employed at church, must be considered as a mere rest from the ordinary occupations of civil life; and he who would defend the institution, as it is required by law to be observed in Christian countries, unless he can produce a command for a *Christian Sabbath*, must point out the uses of it in that view.

"*First*, then, that interval of relaxation which Sunday affords to the laborious part of mankind contributes greatly to the comfort and satisfaction of their lives, both as it refreshes them for the time, and as it relieves their six days' labour by the prospect of a day of rest always approaching; which could not be said of *casual* indulgences of leisure and rest, even were they more frequent than there is reason to expect they would be, if left to the discretion or humanity of interested task-masters. To this difference it may be added, that holy-days, which come seldom and unexpected, are unprovided, when they do come, with any duty or employment; and the manner of spending them being regulated by no public decency or established usage, they are commonly consumed in rude, if not criminal, pastimes, in stupid sloth, or brutish intemperance. Whoever considers how much sabbatical institutions conduce, in this respect, to the happiness and civilization of the labouring classes of mankind, and reflects how great a majority of the human species these classes compose, will acknowledge the utility, whatever he may believe of the origin, of this distinction,—and will consequently perceive it to be every man's duty to uphold the observation of Sunday, when once established, let the establishment have proceeded from whom or from what authority it will.

"Nor is there anything lost to the community by the intermission of public industry one day in the week. For, in countries tolerably advanced in population and the arts of civil life, there is always enough of human labour, and to spare. The difficulty is not so much to procure, as to employ it. The addition of the seventh day's labour to that of the other six, would have no other effect than to reduce the price. The labourer himself, who deserved and suffered most by the change, would gain nothing.

"2. Sunday, by suspending many public diversions, and the ordinary rotation of employment, leaves to men of all ranks and professions sufficient leisure, and not more than what is sufficient, both for the external offices of Christianity, and the retired, but equally necessary, duties of religious meditation and inquiry. It is true that many do not convert their leisure to this purpose; but it is of moment, and is all which a public constitution can effect, that every one be allowed the opportunity.

"3. They whose humanity embraces the whole sensitive creation, will esteem it no inconsiderable recommendation of a weekly return of public rest, that it affords a respite to the toil of brutes. Nor can we omit to recount this among the uses which the Divine Founder of the *Jewish* Sabbath expressly appointed a law of the institution.

"We admit that none of these reasons show why Sunday should be preferred to any other day in the week, or one day in seven to one day in six, or eight; but these points, which in their nature are of arbitrary determination, being established to our hands, our obligation applies to the subsisting establishment, so long as we confess that some such institution is necessary, and are neither able nor attempt to substitute any other in its place.

"CHAP. VII. *Of the Scripture Account of Sabbatical Institutions.* —The subject, so far as it makes any part of Christian morality, is contained in two questions:—

"I. Whether the command, by which the Jewish Sabbath was instituted, extends to Christians?

"II. Whether any new command was delivered by Christ; or any other day substituted in the place of the Jewish Sabbath by the authority or example of his apostles?

"In treating of the first question, it will be necessary to collect the accounts which are preserved of the institution in the Jewish history; for the seeing these accounts together, and in one point of view, will be the best preparation for the discussing or judging of any arguments on one side or the other.

"In the second chapter of Genesis, the historian, having concluded his account of the six days' creation, proceeds thus:—'And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made; and God *blessed* the seventh day and *sanctified* it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.' After this we hear no more of the Sabbath, or of the seventh day, as in any manner distinguished from the other six, until the history brings us down to the sojourning of the Jews in the wilderness, when the following remarkable passage occurs. Upon the complaint of the people for want of food, God was pleased to provide for their relief by a miraculous supply of manna, which was found every morning upon the ground about the camp; 'and they gathered it every morning, every man according to his eating; and when the sun waxed hot, it melted: and it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses: and he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said, *To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath* unto the Lord:* bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over,

* Correctly, "*a* rest of *a* holy Sabbath." See above, i. 8; ii. 100.

lay up for you, to be kept until the morning. And they laid it up till the morning, as Moses bade; and it did not stink [as it had done before, when some of them left it till the morning], neither was there any worm therein. And Moses said, Eat that to-day; *for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord;* to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it, but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath,* in it there shall be none. And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, *for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath*, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days: abide ye every man in his place; let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day.' (Exod. xvi.)

"Not long after this, the Sabbath, as is well known, was established with great solemnity, in the Fourth Commandment.

"Now, in my opinion, the transaction in the wilderness, above recited, was the first actual institution of the Sabbath. For if the Sabbath had been instituted at the time of the creation, as the words in Genesis may seem at first sight to import; and if it had been observed all along from that time to the departure of the Jews out of Egypt, a period of about two thousand five hundred years; it appears unaccountable that no mention of it, no occasion of even the obscurest allusion to it, should occur, either in the general history of the world before the call of Abraham, which contains, we admit, only a few memoirs of its early ages, and those extremely abridged; or, which is more to be wondered at, in that of the lives of the first three Jewish patriarchs, which, in many parts of the account, is sufficiently circumstantial and domestic. Nor is there, in the passage above quoted from the sixteenth chapter of Exodus, any intimation that the Sabbath, when appointed to be observed, was only the revival of an ancient institution, which had been neglected, forgotten, or suspended; nor is any such neglect imputed either to the inhabitants of the old world, or to any part of the family of Noah; nor, lastly, is any permission recorded to dispense with the institution during the captivity of the Jews in Egypt, or on any other public emergency.

"The passage in the second chapter of Genesis, which creates the whole controversy upon the subject, is not inconsistent with this opinion; for, as the seventh day was erected into a Sabbath, on account of God's resting upon that day from the work of the creation, it was natural enough in the historian, when he had related the history of the creation, and of God's ceasing from it on the seventh day, to add,—'And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that on it he had rested from all his work which God created and made;' although the blessing and sanctification, *i. e.*, the religious distinction and appropriation of that

* Correctly, "*a* Sabbath."

day, were not actually made till many ages afterwards. The words do not assert that God *then* 'blessed' and 'sanctified' the seventh day, but that He blessed and sanctified it *for that reason*; and if any ask, why the Sabbath, or sanctification of the seventh day, was *then* mentioned, if it was not *then* appointed, the answer is at hand: the order of connexion, and not of time, introduced the mention of the Sabbath, in the history of the subject which it was ordained to commemorate.

"This interpretation is strongly supported by a passage in the prophet Ezekiel, where the Sabbath is plainly spoken of as *given* (and what else can that mean, but as *first instituted?*) in the wilderness. 'Wherefore I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness; and I gave them my statutes and showed them my judgments, which, if a man do, he shall even live in them: moreover also I *gave them my Sabbaths*, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them.' (Ezek. xx. 10, 11, 12.)

"Nehemiah also recounts the promulgation of the sabbatic law amongst the transactions in the wilderness, which supplies another considerable argument in aid of our opinion:—'Moreover thou leddest them in the day by a cloudy pillar, and in the night by a pillar of fire, to give them light in the way wherein they should go. Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments and true laws, good statutes and commandments, *and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath*, and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant, and gavest them bread from heaven for their hunger, and broughtest forth water for them out of the rock.'* (Nehem. ix. 12.)

"If it be inquired what duties were appointed for the Jewish Sabbath, and under what penalties and in what manner it was observed amongst the ancient Jews, we find that, by the Fourth Commandment, a strict cessation from work was enjoined, not only upon Jews by birth or religious profession, but upon all who resided within the limits of the Jewish state; that the same was to be permitted to their slaves and their cattle; that this rest was not to be violated under pain of death:—'Whosoever doeth any work in the Sabbath-day, he shall surely be put to death.' (Exod. xxxi. 15.) Beside which, the seventh day was to be solemnized by double sacrifices in the temple. (Numb. xxviii. 9, 10.) Also *holy convocations*, which mean, we presume, assemblies for the

* "From the mention of the Sabbath in so close a connexion with the descent of God upon mount Sinai, and the delivery of the law from thence, one would be inclined to believe that Nehemiah referred solely to the Fourth Commandment. But the Fourth Commandment certainly did not first make known the Sabbath. And it is apparent that Nehemiah observed not the order of events, for he speaks of what passed upon mount Sinai before he mentions the miraculous supplies of bread and water, though the Jews did not arrive at mount Sinai till some time after both these miracles were wrought."

purpose of public worship or religious instruction, were directed to be holden on the Sabbath-day,—'the seventh day is a Sabbath of rest, an holy convocation.' (Lev. xxiii. 3.)

"And accordingly we read, that the Sabbath was in fact observed amongst the Jews by a scrupulous abstinence from everything which, by any possible construction, could be deemed labour,—as from dressing meat, from travelling beyond a Sabbath-day's journey, or about a single mile. In the Maccabean wars, they suffered a thousand of their number to be slain, rather than do anything in their own defence on the Sabbath-day. In the final siege of Jerusalem, after they had so far overcome their scruples as to defend their persons when attacked, they refused any operation on the Sabbath-day, by which they might have interrupted the enemy in filling up the trench. After the establishment of synagogues (of the origin of which we have no account), it was the custom to assemble in them on the Sabbath-day, for the purpose of hearing the law rehearsed and explained, and for the exercise, it is probable, of public devotion:—'For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, *being read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day.*' (Acts xv. 21.) The seventh day is *Saturday;* and, agreeably to the Jewish way of computing the day, the Sabbath held from six o'clock on the Friday evening, to six o'clock on Saturday evening. These observations being premised, we approach the main question, Whether the command by which the Jewish Sabbath was instituted extend to us?

"If the Divine command was actually delivered at the creation, it was addressed, no doubt, to the whole human species alike, and continues, unless repealed by some subsequent revelation, binding upon all who come to the knowledge of it. If the command was published for the first time in the wilderness, then it was immediately directed to the Jewish people alone; and something further, either in the subject or circumstances of the command, will be necessary to show that it was designed for any other. It is on this account that the question concerning the date of the institution was first to be considered. The former opinion precludes all debate about the extent of the obligation; the latter admits, and, *primâ facie*, induces a belief, that the Sabbath ought to be considered as part of the peculiar law of the Jewish policy.

"Which belief receives great confirmation from the following arguments:—

"The Sabbath is described as a sign between God and the people of Israel. [Here Exod. xxxi. 16, 17, and Ezek. xx. 12, are quoted by Paley.]

"The distinction of the Sabbath is, in its nature, as much a positive ceremonial institution as that of many other seasons which were appointed by the Levitical law to be kept holy, and to be observed by a strict rest,—as the first and seventh days of unleavened bread; the feast of Pentecost; the feast of Tabernacles: and in the twenty-third chapter of Exodus, the Sabbath and these are recited together.

"If the command by which the Sabbath was instituted be binding upon Christians, it must be binding as to the day, the duties, and the penalty; in none of which it is received.

"The observance of the Sabbath was not one of the articles enjoined by the Apostles, in the fifteenth chapter of Acts, upon them 'which from among the Gentiles were turned unto God.'

"St Paul evidently appears to have considered the Sabbath as part of the Jewish ritual, and not obligatory upon Christians, as such:—'Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or *of the Sabbath-days*, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ.' (Col. ii. 16, 17.)

"I am aware of only two objections which can be opposed to the force of these arguments: one is, that the reason assigned in the Fourth Commandment for hallowing the seventh day, namely, 'because God rested on the seventh day from the work of the creation,' is a reason which pertains to all mankind; the other, that the command which enjoins the observance of the Sabbath is inserted in the Decalogue, of which all the other precepts and prohibitions are of moral and universal obligation.

"Upon the first objection it may be remarked, that although in Exodus the commandment is founded upon God's rest from the creation, in Deuteronomy the commandment is repeated with a reference to a different event. [Here Deut. v. 13–15 is quoted.] It is further observable, that God's rest from the creation is proposed as the reason of the institution, even where the institution itself is spoken of as peculiar to the Jews:—'Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant: it is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever; *for* in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed.' (Exod. xxxi. 16, 17.) The truth is, these different reasons were assigned to account for different circumstances in the command. If a Jew inquired, why the *seventh day* was sanctified rather than the sixth or eighth, his law told him, because God rested on the *seventh day* from the creation. If he asked, why was the same rest indulged to *slaves?* his law bade him remember, that he also was a *slave* in the land of Egypt, and 'that the Lord his God brought him out thence.' In this view, the two reasons are perfectly compatible with each other, and with a third end of the institution, its being a *sign* between God and the people of Israel; but in this view they determine nothing concerning the extent of the obligation. If the reason by its proper energy had constituted a natural obligation, or if it had been mentioned with a view to the extent of the obligation, we should submit to the conclusion that all were comprehended by the command who are concerned in the reason. But the sabbatic rest being a duty which results from the ordination and authority of a positive law, the reason can be alleged no further than as it explains the design of the legislator; and if it appear to be recited

with an intentional application to one part of the law, it explains his design upon no other; if it be mentioned merely to account for the choice of the day, it does not explain his design as to the extent of the obligation.

"With respect to the second objection, that inasmuch as the other nine commandments are confessedly of moral and universal obligation, it may reasonably be presumed that this is of the same, —we answer, that this argument will have less weight when it is considered that the distinction between positive and natural duties, like other distinctions of modern ethics, was unknown to the simplicity of ancient language; and that there are various passages in Scripture in which duties of a political, or ceremonial, or positive nature, and confessedly of partial obligation, are enumerated, and without any mark of discrimination, along with others which are natural and universal.' Of this the following is an incontestable example. [Here Ezek. xviii. 5–9 is quoted.] The same thing may be observed of the apostolic decree recorded in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts [ver. 28, 29, which are quoted].

"II. If the law by which the Sabbath was instituted was a law only to the Jews, it becomes an important question with the Christian inquirer, whether the Founder of his religion delivered any new command upon the subject; or, if that should not appear to be the case, whether any day was appropriated to the service of religion by the authority or example of his Apostles.

"The practice of holding religious assemblies upon the first day of the week was so early and universal in the Christian church that it carries with it considerable proof of having originated from some precept of Christ, or of his Apostles, though none such be now extant. It was upon the *first* day of the week that the disciples were assembled, when Christ appeared to them for the first time after his resurrection: 'then the same day at evening, *being the first day of the week*, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled, for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst of them.' (John xx. 19.) This, for anything that appears in the account, might, as to the day, have been accidental; but in the 26th verse of the same chapter we read, that 'after eight days,' that is, on the *first day* of the week *following*, '*again* the disciples were within;' which second meeting upon the same day of the week looks like an appointment and design to meet on that particular day. In the twentieth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, we find the same custom in a Christian church at a great distance from Jerusalem:—'And we came unto them to Troas in five days, where we abode seven days; and *upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread*, Paul preached unto them.' (Acts xx. 6, 7.) The manner in which the historian mentions the disciples coming together to break bread on the *first day* of the week, shows, I think, that the practice by this time was familiar and established. St Paul to the Corinthians writes thus:—'Concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye; *upon the*

first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gathering when I come.' (1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2.) Which direction affords a probable proof that the *first* day of the week was already, amongst the Christians both of Corinth and Galatia, distinguished from the rest by some religious application or other. At the time that St John wrote the book of his Revelation, the first day of the week had obtained the name of the *Lord's-day*,—'I was in the spirit,' says he, '*on the Lord's-day*.' (Rev. i. 10.) Which name, and St John's use of it, sufficiently denote the appropriation of this day to the service of religion, and that this appropriation was perfectly known to the churches of Asia. I make no doubt that by the *Lord's-day* was meant the *first* day of the week; for we find no footsteps of any distinction of days, which could entitle any other to that appellation. The subsequent history of Christianity corresponds with the accounts delivered on this subject in Scripture.

"It will be remembered that we are contending, by these proofs, for no other duty upon the first day of the week than that of holding and frequenting religious assemblies. A cessation upon that day from labour, beyond the time of attendance upon public worship, is not intimated in any passage of the New Testament; nor did Christ or his Apostles deliver, that we know of, any command to their disciples for a discontinuance, upon that day, of the common offices of their professions—a reserve which none will see reason to wonder at, or to blame as a defect in the institution, who consider that, in the primitive condition of Christianity, the observance of a new Sabbath would have been useless, or inconvenient, or impracticable. During Christ's personal ministry, his religion was preached to the Jews alone. *They* already had a Sabbath, which, as citizens and subjects of that economy, they were obliged to keep; and did keep. It was not therefore probable that Christ would enjoin another day of rest in conjunction with this. When the new religion came forth into the Gentile world, converts to it were, for the most part, made from those classes of society who have not their time and labour at their own disposal; and it was scarcely to be expected that unbelieving masters and magistrates, and they who directed the employment of others, would permit their slaves and labourers to rest from their work every seventh day; or that civil government, indeed, would have submitted to the loss of a seventh part of the public industry, and that too in addition to the numerous festivals which the national religions indulged to the people: at least, this would have been an encumbrance, which might have greatly retarded the reception of Christianity in the world. In reality, the institution of a weekly Sabbath is so connected with the functions of civil life, and requires so much of the concurrence of civil law in its regulation and support, that it cannot, perhaps, properly be made the ordinance of any religion, till that religion be received as the religion of the state.

"The opinion that Christ and his Apostles meant to retain the

duties of the Jewish Sabbath, shifting only the day from the seventh to the first, seems to prevail without sufficient proof; nor does any evidence remain in Scripture (of what, however, is not improbable) that the first day of the week was thus distinguished in commemoration of our Lord's resurrection.

"The conclusion from the whole inquiry (for it is our business to follow the arguments to whatever probability they conduct us), is this: The *assembling* upon the first day of the week for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction, is a law of Christianity, of Divine appointment; the *resting* on that day from our employments longer than we are detained from them by attendance upon these assemblies, is to Christians an ordinance of human institution,—binding, nevertheless, upon the conscience of every individual of a country in which a weekly Sabbath is established, for the sake of the beneficial purposes which the public and regular observance of it promotes, and recommended perhaps in some degree to the Divine approbation, by the resemblance it bears to what God was pleased to make a solemn part of the law which he delivered to the people of Israel, and by its subserviency to many of the same uses.

"CHAP. VIII. *By what Acts and Omissions the Duty of the Christian Sabbath is violated.*—Since the obligation upon Christians to comply with the religious observance of Sunday arises from the public uses of the institution, and the authority of the apostolic practice, the *manner* of observing it ought to be that which best fulfils *these* uses, and conforms the nearest to *this* practice.

"The uses proposed by the institution are;—

"1. To facilitate attendance upon public worship.

"2. To meliorate the condition of the laborious classes of mankind, by regular and seasonable returns of rest.

"3. By a general suspension of business and amusement, to invite and enable persons of every description to apply their time and thoughts to subjects appertaining to their salvation.

"With the primitive Christians, the peculiar, and probably for some time the only, distinction of the first day of the week, was the holding of religious assemblies upon that day. We learn, however, from the testimony of a very early writer amongst them, that they also reserved the day for religious meditations:—'*Unusquisque nostrûm* (saith Irenæus) *sabbatizat spiritualiter, meditatione legis gaudens, opificium Dei admirans.*'

"WHEREFORE the duty of the day is violated,

"1st, By all such employments or engagements as (though differing from our ordinary occupation) hinder our attendance upon public worship, or take up so much of our time as not to leave a sufficient part of the day at leisure for religious reflection,—as the going of journeys, the paying or receiving of visits which engage the whole day, or employing the time at home in writing letters, settling accounts, or in applying ourselves to studies, or the reading of books, which bear no relation to the business of religion.

"2dly, By unnecessary encroachments on the rest and liberty which Sunday ought to bring to the inferior orders of the community,—as by keeping servants on that day confined and busied in preparations for the superfluous elegancies of our table, or dress.

"3dly, By such recreations as are customarily forborne out of respect to the day,—as hunting, shooting, fishing, public diversions, frequenting taverns, playing at cards or dice.

"If it be asked, as it often has been, wherein consists the difference between walking out with your staff, or with your gun? between spending the evening at home, or in a tavern? between passing the Sunday afternoon at a game of cards, or in conversation not more edifying, nor always so inoffensive?—to these, and to the same question under a variety of forms, and in a multitude of similar examples, we return the following answer:—That the religious observance of Sunday, if it ought to be retained at all, must be upholden by some public and visible distinctions;—that, draw the line of distinction where you will, many actions which are situated on the confines of the line will differ very little, and yet lie on the opposite sides of it;—that every trespass upon that reserve which public decency has established, breaks down the fence by which the day is separated to the service of religion;—that it is unsafe to trifle with scruples and habits that have a beneficial tendency, although founded merely in custom;—that these liberties, however intended, will certainly be considered by those who observe them, not only as disrespectful to the day and institution, but as proceeding from a secret contempt of the Christian faith;—that, consequently, they diminish a reverence for religion in others, so far as the authority of our opinion, or the efficacy of our example, reaches,—or, rather, so far as either will serve for an excuse of negligence to those who are glad of any;—that as to cards and dice, which put in their claim to be considered among the *harmless* occupations of a vacant hour, it may be observed that few find any difficulty in refraining from *play* on Sunday, except they who sit down to it with the views and eagerness of gamesters;—that *gaming* is seldom innocent;—that the anxiety and perturbations, however, which it excites, are inconsistent with the tranquillity and frame of temper in which the duties and thoughts of religion should always both find and leave us;—and, lastly, we shall remark, that the example of other countries, where the same or greater license is *allowed*, affords no apology for irregularities in our own; because a practice which is tolerated by public usage, neither receives the same construction, nor gives the same offence, as where it is censured and prohibited."

The ability and clearness with which Dr Paley lays down his doctrine of the Sabbath have on all sides been cordially admitted; and hardly less unanimous has been the assent of thoughtful men to the soundness of his exposition of the use of sabbatical institutions. But his interpretation of *the Scripture account* of them has

been assailed on various and opposite grounds, by adversaries innumerable. Most of these have asserted against him the enactment of a primeval Sabbath-law, which, if it *was* imposed, continues still, according to his own admission, to be binding on all who come to the knowledge of it. (See, for instance, Dwight's *System of Theology*, Serm. 107; Holden's *Christian Sabbath*, chap. 2; Wardlaw's *Discourses on the Sabbath*, Disc. 1; Stopford's *Scripture Account of the Sabbath*, p. 235; and Jordan's *Scriptural Views of the Sabbath of God*, chap. 2.) But others deny that, even supposing a Sabbath-law to have been given to Adam, it now remains in force under the Christian Dispensation; which, they maintain, has wholly superseded the dispensations of earlier times. (Bannerman's *Modern Sabbath Examined*, p. 39; Baden Powell's *Christianity without Judaism*, p. 94; and Cowell and La Placette, quoted above, pp. 61, 127.) "So far," says Mr Powell, "from perceiving any support for the idea that, because a precept or institution was from the beginning, it was *therefore* designed to be of universal and perpetual obligation,—on the contrary, we rather see in its very antiquity a strong presumption that it was of a nature suited and intended only for the earliest stage of the religious development of man." (*Op. cit.*, p. 95.) And he holds that the absence, in the writings and discourses of the Apostles to the Gentiles, "of any reference to *previous obligations* (which, if they had existed, were certainly unknown), is *emphatic*. Any supposed universal law given to the Patriarchs would clearly have required to be revived; but no intimation or even allusion of the kind is to be found in the records of the apostolic teaching. In the conception of the enlightened Gentile convert, there neither was nor could be any reference to what might be recorded in the earliest portion of the Hebrew scriptures, as in the slightest degree *revived* under the Gospel, or as in any way different in its application from what was contained more specifically in the Law. The Gentile knew nothing of any such earlier or general obligations: he embraced the Gospel as standing on its own ground, and in essential *independence of all previous dispensations*, though from its Jewish origin the language of its announcement might be unavoidably mixed up with some references to Jewish peculiarities. Such a reference, for example, was manifestly requisite for any revival of a primeval Sabbath, had it been contemplated, as imagined by some; but, it is needless to say, no such intimation can be found. The only allusion to the subject at all is addressed to the Hebrews (Heb. iv. 4); and the turn of the allusion is figurative and obviously quite different, and to this effect:—There is a rest, a figurative Sabbath (*σαββατισμός*), for the people of God; but it is *not* the rest spoken of after the creation (*ibid.*), *nor* that of the land of Canaan (*ibid.* ver. 8); therefore it is another rest, eternal and heavenly." (P. 130–1.)*

* See also, as to the silence of St Paul concerning the existence, at any time, of a primeval Sabbath-law, a passage from Domville, quoted above, p. 31. Had the apostles taught the doctrine of a primeval Sabbath, how, it has been asked, could Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tertullian

Those theologians who defend the primeval Sabbath against Paley, reject also his opinion that the Puritan doctrine of the identity of the Lord's Day and the Sabbath prevails without sufficient proof.* But, on the other hand, an equally zealous though less numerous body of disputants is found maintaining, like Heylin, Milton, and the Seventh-day Baptists (see above, i. 157, 181; ii. 51, 198–202), that even in representing the Lord's Day as a divinely appointed season for *religious assemblies*, he concludes for something more than the New Testament really warrants.* In this class of Paley's

have been ignorant of it, as they certainly were? (See above, i. 124, 257; ii. 64.)

That the early Gentile Christians thought themselves nowise bound by any law or institution resting on the Jewish Scriptures, appears from a fact mentioned by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History*, B. iv. c. 26. He says that about A.D. 170, a bishop named Onesimus, who had never even seen the Books of the Old Testament, and was ignorant of their number and names, wishing to get information about them, and copies of passages bearing on the Christian faith, applied for these to Melito, bishop of Sardis, who was unable to satisfy him without going to Palestine for the express purpose of investigation, but by this means enabled himself to send Onesimus the earliest catalogue now extant of the Hebrew Scriptures. With this he wrote in the following terms: "Melito sends greeting to his brother Onesimus. Since in thy zeal for the Word thou hast often desired to have selections from the Law and the Prophets concerning the Saviour and the whole of our faith, and hast also wished to obtain an exact statement of the ancient books, how many they were in number, and what was their arrangement,—I took pains to effect this, understanding thy zeal for the faith, and thy desire of knowledge in respect to the Word, and that, in thy devotion to God, thou esteemest these things above all others, striving after eternal salvation. Therefore, having come to the East, and arrived at the place where these things were preached and done, and having accurately acquainted myself with the books of the Old Testament, I have subjoined and sent them to thee, of which the names are these." The original Greek letter may be seen in Theodore Parker's translation of De Wette's *Critical and Historical Introduction to the Old Testament*, vol. i. p. 87; and the foregoing English version of it, described by Parker as faithful and beautiful, is from Palfrey's *Academical Lectures*, vol. i. p. 32.

* It deserves to be mentioned that Milton, when he formed his opinions about the Lord's Day, must have been familiar with the learned treatise *De Die Dominicâ* of Dr Thomas Young (see Nos. 99 and 162, above, i. 193; ii. 38), who was his classical teacher and much respected friend. The book, it will be remembered, is praised by Baxter as the best plea that he knew for the divine authority of the Lord's Day (above, p. 29). Professor Masson, in his recent *Life of Milton*, gives some new information that he has recovered about Dr Young. This divine was born at Loncardy or Luncarty near Perth in 1587 or 1588, and after studying at St Andrews, settled in or near London, where he appears to have supported himself partly by assisting Puritan ministers, and partly by teaching. "By the chances of the time, and the search after a livelihood, it had fallen to a wandering Scot from Loncardy, bred to hardy literature amid the sea-breezes of St Andrews, to be the domestic preceptor of the future English poet! . . . From Young's subse-

opponents are Mr Evanson, in his *Arguments against and for the Sabbatical Observance of Sunday, by a cessation from all Labour* (Lond. 1792); Mr Burnside, a Seventh-day Baptist, in his *Remarks on the Different Sentiments entertained in Christendom relative to the Weekly Sabbath*, chap. 7 (Lond. 1825); Mr Bannerman, *op. cit.*; and Sir William Domville, in his treatise entitled *The Sabbath, or an Examination of the Six Texts commonly adduced from the New Testament in proof of a Christian Sabbath* (Lond. 1849), quoted above, p. 184. By the last, this conclusion of Dr Paley that "the assembling upon the first day of the week, for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction, is a law of Christianity of Divine appointment," is controverted thus:—

"This conclusion," says he, "although it is Paley who maintains it, I shall attempt to show is not warranted by his own premises, and I trust that my presumption in venturing upon this attempt will not be found so great as at first it may appear to be. No one can hold in higher reverence than I do the extraordinary talents of Dr Paley, and, pre-eminently, his power of close and lucid reasoning upon all subjects where he was perfectly free to express the convictions to which his own arguments would naturally lead him; as when, in his *Natural Theology*, he is proving the existence of a God; or when, in his *View of the Evidences of Christianity*, and in his *Horæ Paulinæ*, he is proving the Divine origin of the Christian religion: but on the Sabbath question perfect freedom of discussion was restricted in his case by his position in society. When reasoning upon that subject, although he showed a daring spirit, he evi-

quent career, and from the unusually affectionate manner in which Milton afterwards speaks of him, it is clear that, however his gait and accent may have at first astonished Mrs Milton, he was a man of many good qualities. The poet, writing to him a few years after he had ceased to be his pupil, speaks of the incredible and singular 'gratitude he owed him on account of the services he had done him,' and calls God to witness that he reverenced him as a father (*Epist. Famil.* No. 1). And again, more floridly in a Latin elegy, [which Mr Masson translates, and] the meaning of which, in more literal prose, is that Young grounded his pupil well in Latin, gave him perhaps also a little Greek, and at the same time awoke in him a feeling for poetry, and set him upon the making of English and Latin verses." (Vol. i. p. 54.) The connection between the preceptor and pupil closed about 1622, when Young became preacher to the English merchants in Hamburgh. Afterwards he became vicar of Stow-market, in Suffolk, where he remained about thirty years. During the troubles of Charles the First's reign he was a prominent divine of the Puritan party, and, as we saw, a member of the Westminster Assembly. The pseudonym "THEOPHILUS PHILO-KURIACES *Loncardiensis*," under which he thought it prudent to publish his book on the Lord's Day, is translated by Mr Masson, "Theophilus Kirklover, native of Loncardy;" but I rather think that "Lord's-day-lover" is the intended meaning of "Philo-Kuriaces." The disguise was effectual enough; for though Luncarty is well-known in Scotland as the site of a battle with the Danes, none of Young's English readers probably had heard of it, or, if they had, were aware that it was the place of his birth.

dently felt the weight of the chains which bound him to the University and the Church; and it is partly to this cause that I attribute his illogical conclusion in the instance before us.*

"Indeed, were it not my belief that in this instance he did purposely, though with the best intention, overstate the legitimate inference from his own argument, I should, perhaps, have shrunk from the attempt to show that so practised a logician may for once have drawn an illogical conclusion.

"In entering upon my task I have to remark, that the only proofs Dr Paley offers of the premises upon which he founds the conclusion in question are five of the six Sabbatarian texts, which I have already examined in a preceding chapter. He excludes from his proofs the Text No. III., relating to the meeting of the Apostles on the day of Pentecost; and he rejects entirely the aid which most Sabbatarians endeavour to draw from the Sabbaths of the Old Testament. . . . Thus the consideration of Dr Paley's argument, from which he draws the conclusion that the religious observance of the Sunday is 'a law of Christianity of Divine appointment,' will consist simply of an examination of the inferences which he has drawn from the five texts selected by him from the Christian Scriptures.

"He, however, has a preface to his argument which cannot be passed by without some notice. 'The practice of holding religious assemblies upon the first day of the week was (he says) so early and universal in the Christian Church, that it carries with it considerable proof of having originated from some precept of Christ, or of his Apostles, though none such be now extant.' Upon which preface it is to be remarked:—

"First, He assumes as a fact, before attempting to prove it, that the practice of holding those assemblies was early and universal, or, rather, early and general; for 'so universal' would be a solecism, but 'so general' proves nothing. If the practice was in obedience to a Divine precept, it must have been universal.

"Secondly, All that Dr Paley says of the fact which he thus assumes is, that 'it carries with it considerable proof.' Now 'considerable proof' is, as I have before had occasion to remark, not complete proof. Some doubt remains of a fact, the proof of which is only considerable. Such proof disposes the mind to belief, but does not authorize belief itself; it authorizes only a strong opinion, in the actual truth of which, however, the party entertaining it feels he ought not to place full confidence without further evidence.

"I now proceed to consider Dr Paley's inferences from his five

* "Let me not be understood as intending by this remark to withhold or diminish the praise so deservedly due to this great and good man for the noble and successful efforts which he made in the field of free inquiry. They were such as he could not but be conscious would prove, as no doubt they did, an effectual bar to high preferment. An everlasting reproach will it be to the times in which he lived, that so zealous and able a defender of the truths of natural and revealed religion should not have been raised to the episcopal bench."

texts—those inferences, it is to be borne in mind, constituting the premises from which he draws the conclusion above stated. My aim will be to show, that with respect to the first four texts, he is himself not quite certain that his inferences from them are just; and that with respect to the remaining text, although he there feels certain of his inference, that inference is not of a nature to warrant the conclusion he has come to upon 'the whole inquiry:' nor does he himself state that this text alone would warrant his conclusion; he rests it in part upon his inferences from the first four texts; and those being, by his own candid admission, not free from doubt, it becomes perfectly clear that, the whole of his premises considered, they can be no warrant for the conclusions which he draws from them; for this would be to draw a certain conclusion from uncertain premises, which is contrary both to the acknowledged rules of logic and to the plain dictates of common sense.

"His first text is John xx. 19 (above, p. 255). Of the meeting recorded in it, he has the candour to remark, 'This, for anything that appears in the account, might, as to the day, have been accidental.' Now what might be accidental cannot be assumed to have been by design; proof of design, however, Dr Paley had it not in his power to give, except it be found in the inference which, impliedly, he draws from his second text, where he goes on to say, 'But in the 26th verse of the same chapter we read that 'after eight days,' that is, on the first day of the week following, 'again the disciples were within;' which second meeting upon the same day of the week looks like an appointment and design to meet on that particular day.' No one, however, can maintain that what only 'looks like' proof is proof itself. Yet Dr Paley, who is candid throughout in the statement of his premises, is, we see, too cautious to infer anything more from this (his second) text than that, in connexion with his first, it exhibits some appearance that the meetings mentioned in both the texts were designedly held on the first day of the week. It would, therefore, be absurd to believe that Dr Paley himself believed he had actually proved that these two meetings were designedly held on that particular day. Let us imagine for a moment that his *Natural Theology*, and his *Evidences of Christianity*, had been made up, or even consisted but in part, of '*look-like*' proofs, where would have been his present deservedly high reputation as the most powerful advocate of natural and revealed religion in modern times? Believers would have disregarded, and infidels would have derided, his feeble efforts to establish grave propositions by such a mockery of evidence as this.

"It is undeniable, therefore, that thus far Dr Paley's own premises do not afford him any assistance whatever in sustaining his conclusion that Sunday observance is a law of Christianity, for it is manifest that he himself doubts if they do.

"Of his third text he thus speaks:—'In the 20th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles we find the same custom' (he had not yet proved any custom) 'in a Christian Church at a great distance from Jerusalem. . . . . 'And we came unto them to Troas

in five days, where we abode seven days: and upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them.' The manner in which the historian mentions the disciples coming together to break bread on the first day of the week shows, I think, that the practice by this time was familiar and established.'*

"Here again we find Dr Paley using words of qualification in expressing his opinion. Now it has been very justly observed by an able modern writer that there are but three views which the mind can take of propositions submitted to its consideration, namely, belief, doubt, and disbelief, and of these it can take but one in regard to any one proposition, for each of the three views is incompatible with either of the other two. Where any doubt remains in a man's mind upon any proposition he, properly speaking, neither believes nor disbelieves. If, in the instance before us, Dr Paley believed that the manner of the historian showed that the practice was 'familiar and established,' why did he introduce the words 'I think'? . . .

"He continues his argument by next adverting to his fourth text. 'St Paul to the Corinthians' (he says) 'writes thus:—'Concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye; upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.' (1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2.) Which direction affords a probable proof that the first day of the week was already,† amongst the Christians both of Corinth and Galatia, distinguished from the rest by some religious application or other.'

"Why 'probable proof,' if it was Dr Paley's belief that the direction afforded actual proof? The word 'probable' is superfluous, unless it be intended to express a doubt. This, therefore, is not a text from which Dr Paley can be entitled to draw any certain conclusion; neither can he be entitled to draw any such conclusion from this and the preceding text, considered in connexion with

* "'By this time was familiar and established' is a remarkable phrase, considering it is the accurate Paley who uses it; for, strictly speaking, it should signify that the practice was not established before this time. Could Dr Paley mean this? If he did, he expressed an opinion which, if well founded, is fatal to the Sabbatarian argument. For if the practice was of Divine appointment it must have been in use, and universally so, from the first preaching of the gospel, twenty years and more previous to the time when Paul preached at Troas; and, therefore, if Dr Paley was of opinion that it had been in use during all that period, surely the correct phrase for him to have employed on the occasion would have been 'at this time,' which would not necessarily have implied, as 'by this time' seems to imply, that the practice had only just then become 'familiar and established.'"

† "'Already.' Here again we have an expression which, like 'by this time,' is consistent with the belief that the practice spoken of had only just then come into use, and this was not till twenty-three years after the gospel had been first preached."

each other; for, if he is not sure, but only thinks, that the one shows a custom to meet, and if with respect to the other he is not sure that it affords actual proof, and, therefore, says only that it affords 'probable proof' that the first day of the week was distinguished by some religious application or other, it is evident that he still remains in uncertainty whether or not the two texts taken together prove a custom to meet on that particular day for purposes of religion.

"Dr Paley then proceeds to state the last portion of his premises by quoting the text from the Revelation, 'I was in the spirit on the Lord's day.' Mark now the change in his style. Here he is confident of his fact, and he states it with confidence accordingly. Here we shall find no traces of imperfect conviction as to the truth of this part of his premises—no admission as in his remark upon his first text, that that 'might have been accidental,' which it was essential he should state (and prove if he could) was designed—no parenthetical expression intimating doubt, as 'I think,' in his third text—no phrases which imply probability but nothing more, such as 'probable proof' and 'looks like,' in his two other texts. This is what he says of the text from the Revelation: 'At the time that St John wrote the Book of his Revelation the first day of the week had obtained the name of the Lord's day. 'I was in the spirit (says he) on the Lord's day;' which name and St John's use of it sufficiently denote the appropriation of this day to the service of religion, and that this appropriation was perfectly known to the churches of Asia. I make no doubt but that by the Lord's day was meant the first day of the week.'

"Undertaking, as I did, to show that Dr Paley is not warranted in the conclusion which he draws from his own premises, I am bound for this purpose to admit the certainty of those premises so far as it appears that Dr Paley believed in their certainty himself. I am, therefore, to take for granted, although it is not my opinion,* that St John the Apostle was unquestionably the author of the Book of Revelation, and also that by the phrase of 'the Lord's day' the writer of that book meant the first day of the week, and that the use of it denotes the appropriation of that day to the service of religion; but these inferences from the text in the Revelation being for the present purpose granted, the question arises, Does the text of itself warrant Dr Paley in coming to the conclusion that Sunday observance is a law of Christianity of Divine appointment? I maintain that it does not; because proof of a religious practice prevailing among the churches of Asia towards the close of the first century, even though it had the approbation of one of the Apostles, and though we should suppose (for the text does not show) it to have been universal, can be no proof that it originated in a Divine appointment. Love-feasts were a religious usage observed so early as in the time of the Apostle Paul, and with his sanction, and they very possibly had their origin in a usage of the first converts to Christianity, which had the sanction of

* "See in Chapter iii. examination of Text No. 6."

all the Apostles (Acts ii. 46); yet they could not have been enjoined by Divine authority, for if they had, they never would have been discontinued, and it would have been a religious duty with us to hold love-feasts at this day. It is, moreover, to be recollected, that if St John esteemed one day more than another, St Paul did not; so that the alleged sanction of St John to the practice of Sunday observance in his extreme old age, more than sixty years after the first preaching of the Gospel, can impose no religious obligation upon Christians at this day to practise that observance.* Without other proof, therefore, than the text itself, it cannot be maintained from the text in the Revelation, that the practice of Sunday observance is of Divine appointment.

"Nor does Dr Paley himself, as I have before remarked, attempt to rest his conclusion upon this text. He shows, by the preface to his argument, that he felt it to be incumbent upon him to prove, if he could, that the custom of Sunday observance had its origin and was universal in the earliest times of Christianity, and that to prove only that it was observed at the close of the first century, would be to effect nothing. Hence it is that he first brings forward in succession four of his five texts to prove the early and universal usage of the custom; and hence it is that he draws his conclusion, not from his fifth text alone, but from 'the whole inquiry.' He is evidently, therefore, not certain that his fifth text (the text from the Revelation) taken singly would sustain his conclusion; and he had previously shown he was not certain it could be sustained by his four preceding texts. However, then, we may and must admire his candour in stating his premises doubtfully, we may justly deny his logic in drawing a conclusion as certain from premises admitted by himself to be doubtful. It is this manifestation of imperfect conviction on his part, and in some form or other pervading his argument from its outset to its close, which constitutes my proof that, when Dr Paley states the result of his 'whole inquiry' to be this, 'The assembling upon the first day of the week for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction, is a law of Christianity of Divine appointment,' he is drawing a conclusion not warranted by his own premises.

"I cannot but be aware that, if it be a false conclusion, Dr Paley must have been himself conscious of its being so; but, as I have

* Many scholars now reject the ordinary opinion, here adopted, that the Apocalypse was not written till about the end of the first century. Among these is Olshausen, who ascribes it to the apostle John, but thinks that "the contents, no less than the form of the Apocalypse, indicate that its composition was earlier than that of the Gospel;"—so early, indeed, as "between the death of Nero, and the destruction of Jerusalem." (*Biblical Commentary on the Gospels*. vol. iii. p. 321; Edin. 1849.) The references which it contains to Jerusalem and the temple as still existing, are certainly very significant (chap. xi. ver. 1, 2, 13). For the opposite arguments on this point, which, however, seems to have no very important bearing on the question between Paley and Domville, see Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, art. REVELATION, BOOK OF.

before intimated, I believe his motive to have been good. Whether the end, if good, can in every case justify the means, is questionable. But whether, therefore, the conduct of Dr Paley, if it be such as I have supposed, be in strictness defensible or not, I believe him to have been actuated by a wish to put down the mischievous fanaticism of Judaizing Christians, and to establish among Christians a rationally religious observance of the Sunday, such as would most effectually serve and promote the cause of piety and virtue. Whoever has read his admirable chapter 'on the Use of Sabbatical Institutions," will have seen with what zeal, sincerity, and success, he has advocated the utility of appropriating a stated day to the purposes of devotion and instruction in the duties of religion and morality. But he probably was of opinion, that unless the masses of the people were taught that this practice was not only useful, but 'of Divine appointment,' his scheme of Sunday observance would not only fail of receiving support from any converts which his previous arguments might have made to anti-Sabbatarianism, but that the practice itself would, for want of an assurance that it was originally of Divine appointment, be generally neglected. In the latter opinion, if he entertained it, I think it possible that he was mistaken, and that, on the contrary, the Sunday would be more generally and more religiously observed than it is, were the observance of it placed upon the secure ground of utility, rather than on the debatable ground of Scripture authority. One great advantage would be sure to attend the belief, that the observance of Sunday as a day of public prayer and instruction, though so conducive to the promotion of religion and good morals, is, nevertheless, an institution of human origin: that advantage would be found in the free scope which it would give to all our clergy to advocate from their pulpits the religious observance of the day. As it is, many of the clergy, and those not the least intelligent and eloquent amongst them, are silent upon this subject in their public discourses, because, being opposed in opinion to the puritanical doctrine of a Sunday Sabbath, now so extensively prevailing, they prefer saying nothing to saying what they would wish to say, lest it should create a spirit of dissension and controversy. They do, indeed, sometimes venture to express their opinions freely in published tracts; but they leave the pulpit,—that powerful engine of persuasion,—in the exclusive possession of the Sabbatarian clergy." (Pp. 317–330.)

In thus arguing that Paley has illogically "drawn a conclusion as certain, from premises admitted by himself to be doubtful," Sir W. Domville overlooks the significant clause which Paley introduces parenthetically while in the very act of drawing his conclusion, and which he doubtless intended as a word to the wise who haply should observe it. "The conclusion from the whole inquiry," says he, "(*for it is our business to follow the arguments to whatever* PROBABILITY *they conduct us*), is this," &c. Even in his conclusion itself, therefore, we see the same "manifestation of imperfect conviction" which marks the whole argument—an *avowal*, not the less plain because intimated so gently, that he *had* that consciousness of

the insufficiency of his premises, which Sir William so justly attributes to him. He is candid and logical to the end.

It must further be mentioned, that the passage quoted by Paley as from Irenæus (see above, p. 257) is shown by Sir William (p. 131) to be spurious; a fact which Mr James, in his *Four Sermons on the Christian Sabbath, &c.*, p. 267 (Lond. 1830), had previously pointed out. The passage, nevertheless, continues to be repeated as genuine by writers who think it no part of their duty to look for it in the original—one of the latest being Mr Irwin, Precentor of Armagh Cathedral, in his *Observations on Dr Reichel's Sermon entitled 'The Lord's Day* NOT *the Sabbath,'* p. 52 (Dublin, 1859). A similar passage, adduced as from Irenæus by Dr Dwight and many others, is shown by Sir William (p. 127) to be equally spurious with the other; as we saw above, i. 120.

In another treatise, entitled *The Sabbath, or an Inquiry into the supposed Obligation of the Sabbaths of the Old Testament* (Lond. 1855), the same acute and well-informed writer defends elaborately the opinion of Paley that the Sabbath-law neither existed before Moses, nor ever bound the Gentiles. To this part of the discussion we shall have a fitter opportunity of adverting at a later stage of our survey.

Among Paley's *Sermons* there is one upon the duty, propriety, and utility of public worship (*Works*, iv. 342; Lond. 1838); suggested probably by Gilbert Wakefield's pamphlet in opposition to the practice of it (No. 307), or by its abolition in 1793 by the French Republicans.

301. ADKIN, LANCASTER, A.M., *Rector of Belaugh, near Norwich.*—The Sabbath: a Sermon preached in the parish church of St Stephen's, Norwich, to promote the establishment of Sunday Schools. Norwich, 1785. 8vo. Pp. 55.

Advocating the Puritan view of the Sabbath, the preacher asks, "Can we say that Christians are *released* from the observation of the Fourth Commandment? What was our Saviour's answer to that weighty question, 'Good Master! what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?' Matt. xix. 16; Mark x. 17. Did He not reply, 'Keep the commandments?'" (P. 19.) Mr Adkin forgets that the question was put by a Jew subject to the law of Moses, and on that footing was answered. At page 24 he describes indignantly the general neglect of public worship, and the extensive dedication of the Lord's Day to travelling and amusement.

302. OGDEN, SAMUEL, D.D., *Rector of Lawford, Essex* (*born* 1716; *died* 1778).—Sermons on the Efficacy of

Prayer and Intercession, on the Ten Commandments, &c. Camb. 1786. 2 vols. 8vo.

Two of the sermons are entitled, "Whether the precept of the Sabbath be now obligatory?" and, "The Lord's Day." They will be found in the successive editions of his *Sermons*, published at London in 1788, 1805, 1814, 1832, &c. Bishop Jebb describes his manner as peculiar; "condensed, pungent, eloquent, witty, and pathetic." While admitting the duty and advantage of observing the Lord's Day as a stated time for the worship of God, he doubts whether the observance of a *Sabbath* can be ranked among Christian duties, seeing that in the New Testament "there is not to be found one word to recommend any observance of the Sabbath," and Paul discountenances it to the Gentiles.

303. BELKNAP, JEREMY, D.D., *a Congregational minister at Boston, Massachusetts* (*born* 1744; *died* 1798). —Two Sermons, delivered April 27, 1788, on the Institution and Observation of the Sabbath. Boston, 1801.

According to Dr Belknap, the Ten Commandments were not new laws, nor national and peculiar to the Jews, but "are for substance the same with the law which is written on the heart of man, which we are bound to obey as rational and accountable creatures, under the government of a God who requires us to be holy as He is holy." (P. 5.) And "it cannot be known from the Fourth Commandment that any particular day is to be observed, but only one day in seven." (P. 12.)

304. The Observation of the Christian Sabbath recommended, as particularly necessary to the Wellbeing of Civil Society. By a Minister of the Established Church. Northampton, 1789. 8vo.

305. Plain Thoughts on the Sabbath, with Friendly Hints at a Reform of Morals. By a Clergyman. Lond. 1789. 8vo.

306. CHARLESWORTH, JOHN, M.A., *Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.*—Two Practical Sermons: To which is added, A Short Address on the proper method of employing the Lord's Day. Newark, 1791. 12mo.

307. WAKEFIELD, GILBERT, B.A., *a distinguished*

classical and Biblical scholar, and political writer (born 1756; *died* 1801).—An Enquiry into the Expediency and Propriety of Public or Social Worship. Lond. 1791. 8vo. Pp. 41.

Educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, Mr Wakefield became curate of St Peter's Church in Liverpool, but resigned his office on abandoning certain orthodox opinions. He was bold, honest, and uncompromising, but rash and opinionative; an ardent champion of civil and religious liberty, but arrogant, sometimes even to the borders of intolerance, in contending with opponents. No man ever followed more disinterestedly the dictates of his conscience, or lent a deafer ear to plausible counsellors advising adherence to a Church whose forms of worship and leading doctrines were no longer approved of. Nor, as his friend Dr Aikin has remarked, "did any man, perhaps, ever more fully give way to the openness of his disposition in speaking *the whole truth* concerning men and things, unmoved by common considerations." (*Memoir of John Aikin, M.D.*, by Lucy Aikin, vol. i. p. 351, App. E.; Lond. 1823.)

In the *Enquiry* whose title is prefixed, Mr Wakefield maintains, in a very confident manner, that the practice of public or social worship is at variance with the example and precepts of Christ and his apostles. The passages of Scripture on which he founds this opinion are the following:—

(1.) "And when Jesus had sent the multitudes away, he went up into a mountain apart to pray; and when the evening was come, he was there alone." (Matt. xiv. 23; compare Mark vi. 46, 47.)

(2.) "Then cometh Jesus with the disciples to a place called Gethsemane, and saith unto them, Sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder. And he went forwards a little, about a stone's cast; and kneeled down and prayed." (Matt. xxvi. 36; Mark xiv. 32; Luke xxii. 41.)

(3.) "And he withdrew himself into the wilderness, and prayed." (Luke v. 16.) "And it came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God." (vi. 12.) "And it came to pass, as he was alone praying, his disciples were with him." (ix. 18.)

On these and many other occasions in the life of Jesus, social prayer, says Mr Wakefield, might have been reasonably expected, as in after ages it would certainly have been practised, if our Lord had approved of other than private prayer.

"John," he proceeds, "in the 17th chapter of his Gospel, has given us a longer prayer of Jesus to his Father; but no mention is made of any invitation to his apostles to join, or assist, him in these devotions. And our historian, his favourite disciple, so intimately acquainted with the manners, and sentiments, and discourses of his Divine Master, has left not even the slightest memorial respecting him, that I can discover, which will justify any follower of Jesus in the continuance of united devotions, either in a

family or a congregation. No; this practice seems to be a part of that hay and stubble, which has been laid on the foundation of Christianity by officious zealots, to be destroyed by fire.

"We are told in various passages by the gospel-writers, that our Lord frequented the Jewish synagogues, wherever he came; that he was a constant attendant in the temple, when at Jerusalem; that he went into private families on many occasions; and in all these instances, not to pray (observe that, reader!), but for the sole purpose of promoting, by incidental admonition and pious lessons, the substantial improvement of his hearers, in the knowledge and practice of genuine spiritual benevolent religion; a religion, not consisting of outward exhibitions, but of inward influence; not in the honour of the lips, but the aspirations of the heart; not in the vain oblations of ceremonial homage, but in the sacrifice of the *whole man*, body and spirit, on the altar of the divine will; a religion, consisting, in short, of a complete dedication of our thoughts, faculties, and actions, through every moment of existence, to *God's service*. Yes: the captain of our salvation was accustomed both to walk, and teach, and heal the sick, and dispute, and preach the gospel,* but never *prayed*, in the temple. We are told of his instructions and admonitions in their synagogues and houses,† but not a syllable of *joint prayer*, or *social worship*." (Pp. 14, 15.)

So much for the *example* of our Lord. Turning next to his *precepts*, Mr Wakefield cites, first, such as he conceives to prove, *directly* and *literally*, public worship to be unauthorized by Christianity, and inconsistent with it; and, secondly, such as seem to him by inevitable *inference* disprove and condemn this practice. Of the former sort he adduces the following:—

(4.) "And when thou prayest, be not as the hypocrites are: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen by men. Verily I say unto you, they have their reward. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father who is in secret, and thy Father who seeth in secret will reward thee openly." (Matt. vi. 5, 6.)

(5.) "Jesus saith unto her: Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth." (John iv. 21–24.)

The former passage is thought to be "as indisputable as demonstration" on his side; nay, he finds in it a pretty clear disapproval of even the use of *solitary prayer* in the synagogue or any public assembly of men; "because the reason of disapprobation, here alleged against those Jewish hypocrites, is inseparable from the

* "Matt. xxi. 14. Mark xi. 27. Luke ii. 46; xix.; xx. 1; xxi. 3."

† "Matt. iv. 23; ix. 35; xiii. 3, 4. Mark iii. 1. Luke iv. 15, 16; x. 39; and many other passages in all the gospels."

circumstances of the case: Such a mode of prayer must always of necessity carry an appearance of ostentation with it; and more notoriously must this effect take place in the dwellings of *social* worshippers." (P. 17.) And from the latter verse of the declaration to the woman of Samaria, he infers "the abolition of temple worship, that is, of all public devotion, and by fair inference, every species of ceremonial religion. . . . The disciples of Jesus were to transfer their homage from the forms and shadows to the substance; from external offices to inward piety; from purification by water, and sacrifices, and oblations, to a rational and mental devotion—to the uniform consecration of the thoughts and affections, the heart and soul, to the will of its Creator." (Pp. 19, 20.)

The *indirect* evidence which he quotes is this:—

(6.) "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light." (Matt. xi. 30.)

(7.) "But I say unto you, that in this place is one greater than the temple. . . . The son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath-day." (Matt. xii. 6, 8.)

(8.) "Alas for you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: therefore ye shall receive the greater punishment." (Matt. xxiii. 14.)

His comment on the first of these passages is characteristic:—

"Every man must be left to his own judgment; but, for myself, I feel no difficulty in acknowledging, that the length and frequency of family and public devotions with some denominations, and particularly the majority of the dissenters, would be to me a most irksome slavery, an intolerable burden. With dispositions as serious, with a love of virtue as ardent, with a faith as sincere, as actuates any devotee in Christendom, I yawned at long prayers in my childhood, I slumbered over them in my maturer years; happy that I was not born a son of the circumcision, nor a nursling of the mother of the saints.

"Now, can these practices be at all conformable to the genius of Christianity, that introduce the incumbrances of Judaism and Popery again? What then is become of the spiritual worship of the gospel; and where is that 'liberty, with which Christ has made us free,' if we must 'entangle ourselves once more with a yoke of bondage?' (Gal. v. 1.) Generally speaking, what is conducive to the religious welfare of one description of men, would be equally beneficial to another: but the business of human life must be suspended, and the world would languish in supineness, and relapse to barbarism, if that portion of time were deducted from useful occupations and honourable pursuits, which some of the clerical fraternity and other members of our cathedrals (*some*, I say; for much the greater part dispense with these formalities) misemploy in going backwards and forwards three times a day to public worship. Envious indeed must that man be, who can grudge the labouring clergy, as the humility of their brother Dr Horsley styles them, the little emoluments of their stations, accompanied by such mortification and drudgery as this. In them is that saying true: 'One (the curate) soweth; and another (the rector) reapeth.'" (Pp. 21, 22.)

"The words of Jesus recorded in the second passage (Matt. xii. 6, 8) were, in Mr Wakefield's opinion, "not only to assure us of the superiority of the Christian revelation to the Jewish ritual, but to intimate the utter insignificance of the Temple and the Sabbath under the dispensation of the gospel; to pronounce the entire dispersion of temple rites, and sabbatical institutions, by the bright presence and energetic influence of Christianity, like mists before the sun. 'All things are become new in Christ:'* so that the Temple and its services, the Sabbath and its social worship, are now no more; they are annihilated by the captain of our salvation, who hath rescued us from this bondage of corruption 'into the glorious liberty of the sons of God.'" † (Pp. 22, 23.)

The expostulation to the Pharisees in the third passage (No. 8) does not, he owns, necessarily involve an absolute censure of their long prayers: "but if we reflect on other parts of the conduct of our Lord, if we observe the short formulary which he himself laid down as the standard of our devotions, and the brevity with which he urged his own petition, in a most agonizing moment, 'Father! if it be possible, let this cup pass from me!' if we take, I say, all these considerations into our account, it must be thought highly probable, even from this passage, that our Lord designed to express his disapprobation of long prayers. But this conclusion becomes still more reasonable when we observe also, how, in a former discourse to his disciples, he cautioned them not to use vain repetitions in their prayers after the manner of the heathen; and at the same time reflect, that long prayers are scarcely practicable without some of that idle and babbling tautology so explicitly forbidden. What, for instance, can fly more directly in the face of this prohibition than the Liturgy of the Church of England? The Lord's prayer is repeated with such incessant volubility, that neither priest nor people can possibly summon their faculties to a distinct apprehension of each petition at every revolution; not to mention how often it is gabbled over in a manner unspeakably offensive to every hearer who has not lost, through these shocking habits, a proper sense of that awful veneration with which a defenceless dependent creature should approach the footstool of Omnipotence. If a stranger, unaccustomed to such a form of worship, should enter the church during a repetition of the prayer in question, were he versed in classic letters, he would fancy himself transported to some heathen temple, where the enthusiastic votaries were celebrating the orgies of the deity: or, if Hebrew learning had been his favourite pursuit, his imagination would instantly convey him to Samaria, amidst the vociferations of the four hundred and fifty prophets; 'O! Baal, hear us! O! Baal, hear us!'—Some other repetitions of the Liturgy, as the Gloria Patri, for example, however judicious and scriptural it may be in itself, is a most shameful violation of our Lord's direction; a direction no more regarded, in these instances, than a command of Mahomet,

* 2 Cor. v. 17 † Rom. viii. 21.

or a maxim of Confucius. So has our Church learned Christ!" (Pp. 23–25.)

He next considers the *objections* that may be urged against his views. The address, "*Our* Father," in the Lord's Prayer, needs not, he thinks, be otherwise regarded than as a natural expression, in private, of the Christian sentiment that all mankind are brethren; and as to the assurance that "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. xviii. 20), this may refer, not to meetings for public worship, but to assemblies to promote in *any* way the glory or the purposes of God. "Is human happiness, the grand object of the divine administration, to be promoted no where but in a church or chapel, and by no means but the united noises of a parson, and his clerk, and the congregation?" Would an assembly of subjects of a wicked and selfish tyrant, to consult upon the means of redressing their grievances and stopping his career of wickedness, "be less effectually and truly assembled in the name of that God who has appointed governors only for the good of the governed (Rom. xiii. 4), than any congregation whatever can be for the purposes of public worship? I think not." (P. 27.)

"And now," says he, "after this detail, I reasonably appeal to the patrons of social worship to decide, whether this practice be indeed sufficiently authorized by the mere silence of the Scriptures? Whether a duty of such magnitude would have been left to the discretion of mankind, and appear in the world only as a mere political institution, not essentially connected with Christianity, nor enjoined by it? Yes; if this usage be in truth so very conducive, as it is thought, to the interests of religion, and so inseparable an appendage of it, I should be glad if any advocate could assign me a reason tolerably satisfactory why our Saviour should omit a positive injunction of this great duty, or prescribe no regulations for the conduct of it? This provision on his part would certainly have contributed in a most eminent manner to the peace and welfare of the Church: for the schisms, which have flowed in upon society from this source, abundantly demonstrate the wisdom of some decisive directions from the founder of our faith for the guidance of his followers." (Pp. 28, 29.)

Proceeding next to examine the practice of the *apostles*, Mr Wakefield finds here nothing "sufficient to authorzie the custom of public worship, in opposition to the conduct and directions of our Saviour, who alone is the master and guide of Christians." (P. 31.) Every passage that he has discovered is either "wholly consistent with private worship," or so dissimilar to what is now called social worship, that it cannot with any show of reason be pressed into the cause he is combating. Thus—

(9.) "The apostles were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God." (Luke xxiv. 53.) Might not, he asks, each go, like the Pharisee and the publican in the parable, to make his separate oblation of praise and gratitude, and even of prayer, which yet is not mentioned? (P. 32.)

(10.) "And they prayed and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two thou hast chosen." (Acts i. 24.) But surely an address to the Supreme Being, half a minute long, at so extraordinary a juncture, "is no adequate authority for the establishment of social prayer, perpetually recurring, on no particular urgency of occasion, and long enough to tire the most unrelenting patience. Indeed, the fact is," he adds, "you see nothing at such places, with a few exceptions, but lolling, and gaping, and stretching, and sleeping, and every additional symptom of weariness, independent of bowings, and greetings, and salutations, even among otherwise respectable and virtuous people; a clear demonstration, in my mind, that such an usage is by no means calculated for at least the generality of mankind. And it is a most pleasing consideration to the lover of the gospel, that this rule of life prescribes no practices, but what experience and philosophy unite in proving to be both salutary in themselves and consonant to the undepraved character of the mind of man.—But we are, perhaps, too liberal in our concessions upon the passage of scripture above quoted. It is no absurd supposition, and one abundantly defensible from other writers, that the evangelical historian means only to state the general sentiments of the apostles at that time, and the purport of the prayer which they individually presented to the Almighty." (Pp. 32, 33.)

(11.) "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." (Acts ii. 42.) "Now Peter and John went up together into the temple at the hour of prayer." (Acts iii. 1.) "And when they heard that, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, Lord, thou art God," &c. (Acts iv. 24.) "And when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them." (Acts vi. 6.) "Cornelius . . . a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway." (Acts x. 2.) "And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." (Acts xiii. 3.) To these instances the observations just quoted are thought by Mr Wakefield to be applicable without reserve. "My ideas," says he, "do not at all interfere with expressions of praise and gratitude in any circumstances, when the occasion may call them forth; but what has this to do with social worship at church or chapel? The apostles, in all probability, prayed, for the most part, in private, after the example and direction of their master (Acts x. 9), and had no custom at all similar to modern prayer in a crowded congregation. When they went into the synagogues, they acted in conformity to the established usage of their countrymen: they read and expounded the scriptures, they taught the people, and disputed with the scribes. (Luke iv. 16, 17; Acts ix. 20; xiii. 5, 14, 15, 24; xiv. 1; xvii. 1, 2; xviii. 4.) Excellent edifying practices! and every man who takes upon himself the name of Christ, and professes obedience to the laws of the gospel, should have the resolution and uprightness to forsake his blind guides to follow the apostles—those more per-

fect examples of Christian discipline and doctrine. How shall we otherwise escape the application of that awful and pertinent appeal? 'Why call ye me Lord! Lord! and do not the things which I say?'

"But granting, for the sake of argument, that public worship, like ours at this day, was customary among the apostles, would this be a sufficient authority for us, without the example and against the injunctions of their master? What might be very proper in the infancy of the gospel, may be in no wise necessary at a more advanced period of Christianity. . . . Who does not know how frequently even the apostles were reproved for their gross and inadequate apprehensions of the nature of the Messiah and the quality of his dispensation? Who has not read that fasting* and circumcision,† and all the ceremonies of the Jewish ritual, were continued by the apostles whilst the temple stood? But have our advocates for social worship any inclination to be circumcised? And is fasting a favourite discipline of their religion?

"I do not pretend to very satisfactory acquaintance upon the subject of Jewish devotion, and therefore, if wrong, will gladly accept of more accurate information; but I find no circumstances in the scripture concerning this people that wear any aspect of public worship, as we conduct it; nor yet from an attendance at their synagogues in this country. The object of the Jews in their assemblies seems to be merely to recite the scriptures in the way of praise and thanksgiving (Deut. xxxi. 11), and to sing hymns, after the custom of the first Christians, mentioned by Pliny in his epistles, in honour of the Supreme Being. When the high priest makes a prayer, it is to himself: the congregation neither hear him, nor seem desirous of hearing him, nor at all disposed to join in his petitions. As far as I can judge, the prayer is similar to that mentioned in Num. x. 35, and correspondent to the blessing in the Church of England, pronounced by the bishop, if present, or, in his absence, by the priest: which seems liable to no exception." (Pp. 33–35.)

He alludes to "the gross improprieties, and even wickedness, which mixes itself in our public forms of devotion, and in the celebration of divine worship among most, if not all, denominations of Christians;" and in the concluding section expresses his conviction that all religious ceremonies are not only irreconcilable to true Christianity, but calculated to counteract its influence: They tend to transfer devotion, especially in feeble minds, from the life and heart to mere formalities—to cherish the persuasion, so natural to the human mind, that outward performances may atone for immorality, and that something besides inward holiness and active benevolence can recommend us to the favour of that God, "who looketh not on the outward appearance, but on the heart." (1 Sam. xvi. 7.) "Such Christians are but Israelites still, with a mere change of name. . . . The demure hypocrite, who passes six days in

* Acts x. 30; xiii. 2, 3. † Acts xvi. 3.

the habitual disregard of God and goodness, on the seventh day smites his breast, lifts up his hand and eye in all the mimicry of devotion, and returns, after this dispensing propitiation of long prayers and gesticulation, with additional vigour to his impurities. Away with these wretched remains of barbarity and Judaism! Away with these beggarly elements from the profession of true Christians! How long are we to be nurtured, like babes, with the milk only of the gospel? In vain have we hailed the rising of the sun of righteousness, if we continue walking in the night of infant superstition, or in the malignant twilight of immature and unreformed Christianity. Let us, the spiritual worshippers of the Universal Spirit, have no more fellowship with these dangerous and unfruitful practices, the produce of gross conceptions, uninitiated in the mysteries of the gospel, and exchanging the vital warmth of piety for the fever of fanaticism. 'We were once darkness, but are now light in the Lord. Let us walk as children of the light.' We also will sanctify the Sabbaths of Jehovah with a veneration rigorously scrupulous, as the most merciful institution ever devised for the more unfortunate of our own species and the miserable brute creation; in which the labourer ceases from his toil, and our beast reposes as well as we. *Our* Sabbaths also shall be kept; but not with the leaven of hypocritical formalities and the parade of misguided superstition, in praying for calamities and in deprecating blessings; but in studying the volume of the revealed will of God with unleavened affections, and a single eye; in expounding the wonders of the divine law to our poor and unlearned brethren; for whom Christ also, in his generation, preached the gospel. Thus shall we become fellow-labourers in the same vineyard with Christ and with God; and by the true means, infinitely more than by prayers, baptisms, and sacraments, accelerate the general reformation of mankind; an achievement to be accomplished by this process only." (Pp. 38–40.)

Mr Wakefield's objections apply, then, not to public *instruction* in religion, but only to social *worship*.

His bold and confident attack on so time-honoured a practice immediately drew forth sundry replies, the best of which proceeded from the circle of his personal friends. (See Nos. 308, 311.) It was not, however, denied that his criticisms on the *mode* of conducting public worship were in some degree merited; and to him may justly be ascribed not a little of the improvement which has taken place since he wrote. That there is room for still further improvement, is the opinion of many members of Episcopalian as well as Presbyterian churches.

Mr Wakefield defended himself in two pamphlets (Nos. 314, 315), and in the Appendix to the second edition of his *Enquiry*, published in 1792. While acknowledging one or two mistakes, he steadfastly adhered to the leading principle of his *Enquiry*. It appears, however, that he abstained from obtruding his peculiar opinions in conversation, or discussing them with any but his in-

timate friends. Nay, "He never attempted," say the editors of his *Memoirs*, "to influence even his own family, and, which will doubtless excite admiration, he uniformly dined on Sundays at a much earlier hour than usual, to allow his servants the opportunity of attending public worship. Likewise, to avoid the possibility of misleading, by his example, the thoughtless and the dissipated, he scarcely ever quitted his house on Sundays." (*Memoirs*, ii. 318; Lond. 1804.) The editors observe that Milton also, in his latter years, frequented no place of public worship, and forebore to use external forms of devotion in his family—

> "Other rites
> Observing none, but adoration pure,
> Which God likes best." (*Paradise Lost*, iv.)

In Mr Wakefield, they suggest, the opinion against public worship might be imperceptibly fostered by that aversion which he so freely avowed to the mode of conducting it among those of the dissenters with whom his intercourse was greatest. Besides, say they, "his enviable seclusion from the tumultuous engagements of the world, and an early attachment to religious inquiries, might also depreciate in his esteem the importance of those institutions which others, less happily circumstanced, have regarded as highly conducive to their Christian improvement; or he had seen too many instances in which what was called religion 'consisted entirely in minute observances and formal grimaces, with which the wicked can comply as well as the good.' (Jortin's *Erasmus*, i. 52.) Let him not, then, be too severely censured if, in contemplating the abuse of religious observances, he disparaged their advantages, while by precept and example he still (to borrow again the words of Jortin in the same place) 'made religion to consist in such things as none except worthy persons ever observe; in the exercise of those Christian virtues which are formed in the mind from the knowledge of our duty and a persuasion of its importance.'" (P. 320.)

The apparent contradiction between his harshness of manner in controversy and the substantial kindness of his temper, is ascribed by Dr Aikin to the warmth of his zeal in what he thought the cause of truth, and perhaps his familiarity with scholastic debates, which rendered him in some measure callous to the use, or rather abuse, of vituperative expressions from the press. To his honour be it added, that Wakefield was one of the few Biblical scholars of his time who advocated a more rational mode of studying and interpreting the Scriptures than was then, or is even now, in general use. "Until," says he, "the books of the Old and New Covenant shall be made by scholars the subjects of rational philology, and be read, studied, and criticised like an *ancient classic*, we are highly unreasonable in expecting a removal of the veil from the hearts of unbelievers." (*Memoirs*, ii. 192.)

308. BARBAULD, ANNA LÆTITIA (*born* 1743; *died* 1825).—Remarks on Mr Gilbert Wakefield's Enquiry

„into the Expediency and Propriety of Public or Social Worship. Lond. 1792. 8vo. Pp. 76.

This eloquent and vigorous production is included in Mrs Barbauld's *Works* (vol. ii. p. 413; Lond. 1825); to which a Memoir of the accomplished author is prefixed by her niece Lucy Aikin.

Her position is, that Public Worship stands on the basis of utility and good sense; being agreeable to our nature, sanctioned by universal practice, countenanced by revealed religion, and favourable to the morals and manners of mankind.

"What is Public Worship? Kneeling down together while prayers are said of a certain length and construction, and hearing discourses made to a sentence of scripture called a text!—Such might be the definition of an unenlightened person, but such would certainly not be Mr Wakefield's. The question ought to be agitated on much larger ground. If these practices are shown to be novel, it does not follow that Public Worship is so, in that extensive sense which includes all modes and varieties of expression. To establish its antiquity, we must therefore investigate its nature.

"Public Worship is the public expression of homage to the Sovereign of the universe. It is that tribute from men united in families, in towns, in communities, which individually men owe to their Maker. Every nation has therefore found some organ by which to express this homage, some language, rite, or symbol, by which to make known their religious feelings; but this organ has not always, nor chiefly, been words. The killing an animal, the throwing a few grains of incense into the fire, the eating bread and drinking wine, are all in themselves indifferent actions, and have apparently little connection with devotion; yet all of these have been used as worship, and are worship when used with that intention. The solemn sacrifices and anniversary festivals of the Jews, at which their capital and their temple were thronged with votaries from every distant part of the kingdom, were splendid expressions of their religious homage. Their worship, indeed, was interwoven with their whole civil constitution; and so, though in a subordinate degree, was that of the Greeks and Romans, and most of the states of antiquity. There has never existed a nation, at all civilized, which has not had some appointed form of supplication, some stated mode of signifying the dependence we are under to the Supreme Being, and as a nation imploring his protection. It is not pretended that these modes were all equally rational, equally edifying, equally proper for imitation, equally suitable for every state of society; they have varied according as a nation was more or less advanced in refinement and decorum, more or less addicted to symbolical expression—to violent gesticulation—and more or less conversant with abstract ideas and metaphysical speculation. But whether the Deity is worshipped by strewing flowers and building tabernacles of verdure; by dances round the altar and the shouts of a cheerful people; by offering the first fruits of harvest, and partaking in the social feast; by tones of music, interpreted

only by the heart; or by verbal expressions of gratitude and adoration—whether the hallelujahs of assembled multitudes rise together in solemn chorus; or whether they listen with composed and reverential attention to the voice of one man, appointed by them to be the organ of their feelings—whether a number of people meet together like the Quakers, and each in silence prefers his mental petition—wherever men together perform a stated act as an expression of homage to their Maker, there is the essence of public worship; and public worship has therefore this mark of being agreeable to the nature of man, that it has been found agreeable to the sense of mankind in all ages and nations.

"It is, indeed, difficult to imagine that beings, sensible of common wants and a common nature, should *not* join together in imploring common blessings; that, prone as men are in every other circumstance to associate together, and communicate the electric fire of correspondent feelings, they should act with unsocial reserve only where those interests are concerned which are confessedly the most important. Such is the temperament of man, that in every act and every event he anxiously looks around him to claim the gratulation or sympathy of his fellows. Religion, says Mr Wakefield, is a personal thing; so is marriage, so is the birth of a child, so is the loss of a beloved relative, yet on all these occasions we are strongly impelled to public solemnization. We neither laugh alone, nor weep alone; why then should we pray alone? None of our feelings are of a more communicable nature than our religious ones. If devotion really exists in the heart of each individual, it is morally impossible it should exist there apart and single. So many separate tapers, burning so near each other, in the very nature of things must catch, and spread into one common flame. The reciprocal advantages which public and private worship possess over each other, are sufficiently obvious to make both desirable. While the former is more animated, the latter comes more intimately home to our own circumstances and feelings, and allows our devotion to be more particular and appropriated. To most of the objections made against the one, the other is equally liable. Superstition can drop her solitary beads, as well as vociferate the repetition of a public collect: if symptoms of weariness and inattention may be observed in our churches, we have only to look into the diaries of the most pious Christians, and we shall find still heavier complaints of the dulness and deadness of their spiritual frame: the thoughts may wander in the closet when the door is shut: folly and selfishness will send up improper petitions from the cell as well as from the congregation: nay, Public Worship has this great advantage, that it teaches those to pray, who, not being accustomed to think, cannot of themselves pray with judgment. To all, it teaches that we are not to pray for exclusive advantages, but to consider ourselves as members of a community. Our inmost wishes learn restraint while our petitions are thus directed, and our desires by degrees conform themselves to that spirit of moderation and justice, without which we cannot join in the comprehen-

sive prayer, that must include the joint supplications of a numerous assembly.—Public Worship has this further advantage over private, that it is better secured against languor on one side, and enthusiasm on the other. If the devotional sentiment has not taken deep root in his mind, a man will scarcely keep up, in silence and in solitude, an intercourse to which he is prompted by no external appearance, and of which he is reminded by no circumstance of time or place. And if his sense of invisible things is strong enough to engage his mind in spite of these disadvantages, there is room to fear, lest, by brooding in silence over objects of such indistinct vastness, his bewildered ideas and exalted imagination should lead him to the reveries of mysticism; an extreme no less to be dreaded than that of indifference. When Mr Wakefield, to strengthen his argument for seclusion in our religious exercises, directs our attention to the Mount of Olives and the garden of Gethsemane, he should recollect that our Saviour sustained a character to which we cannot presume to aspire; and that, however favourable the desert and the wilderness have been to prophets visited by extraordinary illuminations, they cannot be equally suitable to the regular devotion of ordinary Christians. From the gloom of the cloister and the loneliness of the cell, have proceeded the most extravagant deviations from nature and from reason. Enthusiasm is indeed most dangerous in a crowd, but it seldom originates there. The mind, heated with intense thinking, adopts illusions to which it is not exposed when its devotion is guided and bounded by addresses which are intended to meet the common sentiments of a numerous assembly. Religion then appears with the most benignant aspect, is then least likely to be mistaken, when the presence of our fellow-creatures points out its connection with the businesses of life and the duties of society. Solitary devotion, for worldly minds, is insufficient, for weak minds it is not profitable, for ardent minds it is not safe." (Pp. 4–11.)

After criticising Mr Wakefield's opinions on Prayer, Mrs Barbauld continues:—

"But supposing we were to discard all petition as the weak effort of infirm minds to alter the unbroken chain of events; as the impatient breathings of craving and restless spirits, not broken into patient acquiescence with the eternal order of Providence—the noblest office of worship still remains.

> '*Praise* is devotion fit for mighty minds,
> The jarring world's agreeing sacrifice.'

. . . . Social worship, for the devout heart, is not more a duty than it is a real want.

"If Public Worship," she proceeds, "is thus found to be agreeable to the best impulses of our nature, the pious mind will rejoice to find it, at least, not discountenanced by revealed religion. But its friends, in endeavouring to prove this, must carry on the argument under some disadvantage, as Mr Wakefield, though he lays great stress on the presumptive arguments which seem to favour

the negative side of the question, will not allow the same force to those which may be urged on the other side. 'The practice of Christ,' he tells us, 'is an authority to which all believers will bow the knee, a tribunal by which all our controversies must be awarded:' yet he gives us notice at the same time, that to this authority, if brought against him, he will not bow the knee; and from this tribunal, if unfriendly to his cause, he will appeal; for that prayers, and all external observances, 'are beggarly elements,' to be laid aside in the present maturity of the Christian church; and that, 'even if social worship were an original appendage of the gospel, the idea of a progressive Christianity' would justify us in rejecting it. With this inequality of conditions, which it is sufficient just to notice, let us consider the array of texts which are drawn up against the practice in question; and particularly those precepts which, Mr Wakefield says, are evidences that directly and literally prove Public Worship to be 'unauthorized by Christianity, and inconsistent with it,' and which he distinguishes from those which condemn it merely by inference." (Pp. 18–22.)

To the first of these direct evidences (Matt. vi. 5, 6; above, p. 271), she replies that the force of the precept is evidently aimed, not against public prayer, but against private prayer ostentatiously performed in public. And in the second (John iv. 21–24; p. 271), she finds only the doctrine that the acceptableness of prayer depends not on the sacredness of any particular place.

"With regard to the character of our Saviour himself, it is certain," she admits, "he did not always call upon his disciples to share that more intimate, and, if I may say so, confidential, intercourse with his heavenly Father, which he may be supposed to have been favoured with; and it must be confessed, there is no formal mention made of any exercises of this kind either with them, or with the people at large. But his whole life was a prayer. He, who in his most familiar and convivial moments, was raising the thoughts of his hearers to God, and nourishing their piety by occasional instruction, could not be supposed to leave them disinclined to the intercourses of social piety. The beautiful commendatory prayer which he offered up when about to leave the world, though it was not entirely of the nature of social prayer, as his disciples did not join in it, yet, its being uttered in their presence, and their being the object of it, seems to place it nearly on the same ground. In the very miracle of the loaves, which Mr Wakefield has produced as an instance of an incident which might have given rise to public prayer, and which was suffered to pass without it—in the account of this very miracle there is a direct precedent for the practice in question; for, looking up to heaven, he blessed before he brake the bread. This, indeed, appears to have been his constant practice. It certainly does not belong to private devotion, and is a species of prayer more apt, perhaps, than any other, to degenerate into a mere form.

"But if we do not find Public Worship, properly so called, in the life of our Saviour, it is because we look for it in the wrong place.

"It is not to be sought for in his instructions, either to the multitude at large, or to his disciples in their more private conversations. His public worship was paid where the rest of the Jews paid theirs—in the Temple. He came up, with the concourse of assembled multitudes, to the appointed religious festivals; he ate the passover, and associated with his fellow-citizens, even in those rites and that form of worship which he knew was so soon to be abolished. Our Lord seems indeed to have been an early and regular frequenter of whatever public worship the Jews had among them." (Pp. 25–27.)

But, besides, it must be remembered that the great business of our Lord in the world was *instruction*; and that this He dispensed, "not in a systematic, but a popular manner; nor yet in a vague and declamatory style, but in a pointed and appropriate one; not where it would most shine, but where it was most wanted. He was the great reformer, the innovator of his day; and the strain of his energetic eloquence was strongly pointed against abuses of all kinds, and precisely those points of duty were most insisted on which he found most neglected. Almost all his discourses are levelled against some prevailing vice of the times, some fashionable worldly maxim, some artful gloss of a well-known precept, some evasion of an acknowledged duty. They were delivered as occasion prompted, and therefore it was that they came so home to men's business and bosoms; for he might have delivered the most elaborate lectures on morality, and religion too, without offending the Scribes and Pharisees, if he had confined himself to system, and not attacked corruption. We shall therefore meet with continual disappointment if, in the few scattered discourses, most of them, too, conversations, which are preserved to us of our Saviour, we expect to find anything like a regular code of laws, and still less a formulary of rules. He referred to known laws, and only endeavoured to restore the spirit of them, and to exalt the motive of obedience. The great duty of honouring our parents had probably not found a place in his instructions, but to expose the tradition which had 'made it of none effect.' It is therefore a very inconclusive argument against a practice, either that we are not expressly enjoined it in the gospel, or that the abuses of it are strongly dwelt upon; and this may serve for a general answer to Mr Wakefield's objections built upon the animated denunciations against those who, for a pretence, make long prayers, and who cry, Lord, Lord,—against vain repetitions—upon the exhortations to worship in spirit and in truth—the declaration that the Sabbath is made for man, and not man for the Sabbath—with a thousand others in the same strain, with which the gospel undoubtedly abounds. But is the utility of a practice destroyed by the abuse of it, or is it of none, because it is not of the chief value? Are none of our duties subordinate, yet real? or have they all the proud motto, *Aut Cæsar, aut nullus?*" (Pp. 31–33.)

As to the *utility* of public worship, she observes: "It is an error, which is extremely incident to minds of a delicate and anxious sensibility, to suppose that practices do no good which do not all

the good that might be expected from them. Let those who, in a desponding mood, are apt to think thus of public worship, calculate, if they can, what would be the consequence if it were laid aside. Perhaps it is not easy to estimate how much of the manners as well as the morals—how much of the cultivation as well as the religion of a people are derived from this very source. If a legislator or philosopher were to undertake the civilization of a horde of wild savages, scattered along the waste in the drear loneliness of individual existence, and averse to the faces of each other—if he had formed a plan to gather them together, and give them a principle of cohesion; he probably could not take a more effectual method than by persuading them to meet together in one place—at regular and stated times—and there to join together in a common act, imposing from its solemnity and endearing from the social nature of its exercises. If an adventurer were stranded on some foreign shore, and should find the inhabitants engaged in such an act, he might draw the conclusion, that the blessings of order, internal peace, mutual confidence, and a considerable degree of information, existed there, as surely as the philosopher drew a similar inference from the discovery of mathematical diagrams traced upon the sand. And thus, in fact, it was, that in the early beginnings of society, legislators called in the assistance of religious ideas, and with the charm and melody of solemn hymns, like those of Orpheus or of Linus, gathered round them the stupid, incurious barbarians, roused them to attention and softened into docility. Agreeably to this train of thinking, our great dramatic moralist places the influences of social worship upon a par with the sacred touches of sympathetic sorrow, and the exhilarating pleasures of the hospitable board, and makes it one of the features which distinguish the urbanity of polished life from the rude and unfeeling ferocity which belongs to a clan of unprincipled banditti.

> 'If ever you have looked on better days,
> If ever been where bells have knolled to church,
> If ever sate at any good man's feast,
> If ever from your eye-lids wiped a tear,
> And known what 'tis to pity and be pitied;
> Let gentleness your strong enforcement be,' &c.

For, independent of the peculiar object of public religious assemblies, many collateral advantages are derived from them which the liberal thinker will by no means despise. The recurrence of appointed days of rest and leisure, which, but for this purpose, would never have been appointed, divides the weary months of labour and servitude with a separating line of a brighter colour. The church is a centre of union for neighbours, friends, and townsmen; and it is a reasonable and a pleasing ground of preference in our attachments, that we have 'walked to the house of God in company.' Even the common greetings that pass between those who meet there, are hallowed by the occasion of the meeting, and the spirit of civic urbanity is mingled with a still sweeter infusion of Christian courtesy. By the recurrence of this intercourse, feuds and

animosities are composed, which interrupted the harmony of friends and acquaintance; and those who avoided to meet because they could not forgive, are led to forgive, being obliged to meet. Its effect in humanising the lower orders of society, and fashioning their manners to the order and decorum of civil life, is apparent to every reflecting mind. The poor who have not formed a habit of attending here, remain from week to week in their sordid cells, or issue thence to places of licentiousness more sordid; while those who assemble with the other inhabitants of the place, are brought into the frequent view of their superiors; their persons are known, their appearance noted; the enquiring eye of benevolence pursues them to their humble cottages, and they are not unfrequently led home from social worship to the social meal." (Pp. 35–39.)

Moreover, Public Worship conveys a great deal of instruction in an indirect manner; it is a means of invigorating faith; and, by bringing all ranks of men together on an equal footing as brethren and citizens, it serves the cause of freedom as well as of virtue.

Is the obligation universal—does it claim the attendance of the learned and refined man of piety, along with the multitude, whose need of improvement and instruction is greater? Without condemning those who, being competent to judge, decide this question in the negative, Mrs Barbauld submits a few considerations as worthy of their attention. "It is, in the first place, an act of homage, and as such equally incumbent on all. It is a profession of faith, less dubious even than the performance of moral duties, which may proceed from a well-directed prudence, or the harmony of a happy temperament. It is right and proper that religion should have the honour of those who are calculated to do her honour. It is likewise useful for a pious man to be connected with pious people as such. . . . But the attendance of men of literature and knowledge is perhaps most important from its effect upon others. The unenlightened worship with most pleasure, where those worship whose opinions they respect. A religion that is left for the vulgar will not long satisfy even them. There is harshness in saying to the bulk of mankind, Stand aside, we are wiser than you. There is harshness in saying, Our affections cannot move in concert; what edifies you disgusts us; we cannot feel in common, even where we have a common interest. In the intercourses of life, the man of urbanity makes a thousand sacrifices to the conciliating spirit of courtesy, and the science of attentions. The exercises of devotion, Mr Wakefield says, are wearisome. Suppose they were so, how many meetings do we frequent, to how many conversations do we listen with benevolent attention, where our own pleasure and our own improvement are not the objects to which our time is given up? He who knows much, must expect to be often present where he can learn nothing. While others are receiving information, he is practising a virtue. . . .

"It becomes us well to consider what would be the consequence, if the desertion of men of superior sense should become general in our assemblies. Not the abolition of public worship; it is a prac-

tice too deeply rooted in the very propensities of our nature; but this would be the consequence, that it would be thrown into the hands of professional men on the one hand, and of uninformed men on the other. By the one it would be corrupted, it would be debased by the other. Let the friends of moderation and good sense consider whether it is desirable, whether it is even safe, to withdraw from the public the powerful influence of their taste, knowledge, and liberality." (Pp. 49-52.)

Mrs Barbauld adds a few paragraphs on behalf of the Dissenters, but acknowledges that "in order to give Public Worship all the grace and efficacy of which it is susceptible, much alteration is necessary. It is necessary here, as in every other concern, that timely reformation should prevent neglect. Much might be done by judgment, taste, and a devotional spirit united, to improve the plan of our religious assemblies." (Pp. 60, 61.) Thus (she suggests) many of our churches are ill adapted to the purposes of hearing or seeing; the isolating effect of high-partitioned pews is prejudicial; the religious instruction ought to be less vague, desultory, and unedifying, than it unhappily is; while religion should be dissociated from that idea of gloom, which, in this country, but too generally accompanies it, and which is attributed by Mrs Barbauld partly to our melancholy and unsocial character as a nation, and partly to the colour of those widely-accepted religious systems which inculcate the eternity of penal torments, the dependence of our future lot on an arbitrary decree of election or reprobation, and the insufficiency of virtue to escape the wrath of God; in a word, "all the tremendous horrors of the Calvinistic faith."* . . . . "Public Worship," says she, "will be tinctured with gloom, while our ideas of its object are darkened by superstition; it will be infected with hypocrisy, while its professions and tenets run counter to the genuine, unperverted moral sense of mankind; it will not meet the countenance of philosophers, so long as we are obliged to unlearn our ethics, in order to learn divinity. Let it be considered that these opinions greatly favour immorality. The doctrine that all are vile, and equally merit a state of punishment, is an idea as consolatory to the profligate, as it is humiliating to the saint. And that is one reason why it has always been a favourite doctrine." (P. 73.)

309. PARRY, WILLIAM, *a Dissenting Minister at Little Baddow, in Essex.*—A Vindication of Public and Social Worship; containing an Examination of the Evi-

* This part of Mrs Barbauld's pamphlet is largely quoted in *Sabbath Laws*, p. 230, *et seq.*; where are cited also some passages to the same effect from John Wesley, Archbishop Tillotson, Bishops Watson and Newton, and Dr Parr.

As to the utility of public worship, see the extracts from Addison, Jortin, and Vicesimus Knox, above, pp. 156, 231, 241; also Paley's *Moral Philosophy*, Book V., chap. 4, and his sermon on the subject.

dence concerning it in the New Testament, and of Mr Wakefield's Enquiry into its Propriety and Expediency. Lond. 1792. 8vo. Pp. 67.

Here the texts quoted by Wakefield are more particularly considered than by Mrs Barbauld. Mr Parry observes that "the attack made by Mr Wakefield's pamphlet on the propriety of public worship has the merit of being new; but by summoning the friends of religion to its defence, in a quarter which had not before been assailed, the conflict will probably terminate in establishing, not only the lawfulness, but the obligation of social worship upon invincible arguments: and thus instead of proving an injury to the cause of practical religion, it will be the accidental occasion of strengthening one of its bulwarks against future assaults. The attack, indeed, has not been formidable; but the just fame which Mr Wakefield has acquired in some of the walks of literature, may render it useful to discuss fully, what would scarcely have deserved reply, had it fallen from a less learned pen. From his established reputation, and the loss he has sustained by following his convictions, he is entitled to full credit for the purity of his motives, even in this singular performance. But neither a regard for literary eminence, nor that respect which is due to integrity, should influence the human mind to receive opinions without sufficient evidence of their truth; or lead it to depart from what has been long considered as an important branch of religious practice, unless it be proved to be unscriptural and injurious." (P. 2.) Mr Parry endeavours to show that the example and precepts of Christ, and the practice of the apostles, afford "irrefragable evidence in *favour* of public worship, and lead to conclusions directly *opposite* to those Mr Wakefield has drawn from them."

According to Mr Parry, the texts Nos. 1, 2, and 3 (above, p. 270), intimate only that Jesus chose to be alone at his *private* devotions, and it is strange to infer that because he was a friend to private devotion he was an enemy to public. That the prayer recorded in John xvii. was spoken by Jesus in the company of his disciples, is inferred from the manner in which the evangelist introduces it,—"These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven;" and from the statement subjoined to it,—"When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth *with his disciples*;" besides that the following expressions in the prayer itself appear to indicate their presence: "And now I am no more in the world, but *these* are in the world" (ver. 11). "Neither pray I for *these* alone" (ver. 20). "These things I speak in the world, that they may have my joy fulfilled in themselves" (ver. 13).

Mr Parry notices what he regards as an important fact, unmentioned by Wakefield, namely, that "it was the *custom* of Jesus to go into the synagogues," or, as he chooses to express himself, "to attend the social worship of the Jews" therein. (Luke iv. 16.) "Though it had not previously been usual with him to *speak*, it was his custom to *attend* the synagogue, in the place 'where he

had been brought up.' It will hardly be denied that social prayer constituted part of the service of the synagogue. If such worship were unlawful, it cannot be supposed that our Lord would have given it his countenance and support." (P. 10.) But I find no *proof* that public worship was *then* practised in synagogues, whatever might afterwards be the case among the Jews. At all events, not a vestige of it there is to be found *in Scripture*.

That our Lord was in the practice of using social prayer *with his disciples*, Mr Parry infers from Luke ix. 28, 29, Matt. xvii. 2, and Mark ix. 2, &c., where it is said that he was transfigured "*as* he prayed on the mount," and that "he was transfigured *before them*." As another instance of social worship, Luke xi. 1 is quoted:—"And it came to pass, that, as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples." (See also Matt. xix. 13, and Mark x. 16.)

In regard to the *precepts* of Jesus, Mr Parry, like Mrs Barbauld, denies that Mr Wakefield's 4th text (above, p. 271) relates at all to *social* or *public* worship. "It is," says he, "a good rule of interpretation, generally allowed by divines of all persuasions, and what is abundantly more valuable, dictated by every sound understanding, that the *connected* sense of Scripture is its *true* sense. Let it be applied then to *this*, as it undoubtedly ought to every other passage." The subject in hand will then be found to be *personal*, not *social* devotion. (P. 16.) He controverts the opinion of Wakefield, that in text No. 5 (above, p. 271), the abolition of "all *public* devotion" is implied in the reference to the abolition of all *temple*-worship. "If we might but introduce on all occasions our 'That is,' how easily might many *obstinate* texts be made to truckle to a favourite hypothesis! . . . By what rule in logic does Mr Wakefield infer, that because public worship, under the Christian dispensation, was not to be restricted to *one* place, therefore it was not to be observed in *any* place?" (P. 20.)

In considering the 7th and 8th texts adduced by Wakefield (above p. 272), Mr Parry holds that the former implies nothing beyond what it is usually understood to teach (see, for instance, Dr Clarke's paraphrase of it, above, p. 170); while in the latter he finds indeed a condemnation of the hypocrisy of long prayers for the purpose of ostentation, and a censure of the practice of extending prayer to an unedifying length, but nothing to countenance Mr Wakefield's assertion that the "inevitable inference" from it is a condemnation of all public and social prayers.

The invocation, "Our Father," in the Lord's Prayer, is not insisted on by Mr Parry as decisive, though he thinks it accords better with the idea of social worship than with personal devotion. (P. 28.)

With regard to the saying of Jesus, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name," &c. (Matt. xviii. 20), Mr Wakefield is censured for omitting the preceding verse, "Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching any

thing *they shall ask*, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. *For* where two or three," &c. Our Lord, then, was expressly speaking of social worship, and not of assemblies for any other good purpose; though, it is admitted, these might properly enough be described as meetings in the name of Christ.

As for that occasion when social prayer was offered by the apostles at the election of an associate in the room of Judas (Text No. 10, p. 275), Mr Parry holds that in allowing it to be an instance of social prayer at all, though but "half a minute long," Mr Wakefield grants what establishes the lawfulness of such a practice. (P. 33.) "The instance of Peter and John going up to the temple at the hour of prayer is not to the purpose, for there is no evidence they prayed at all upon that occasion. The case of Cornelius refers to the devotion of an individual, and does not relate to the subject. And Peter's going up to the housetop to pray, only proves that, like his master, he chose to be alone at his private devotions; but nothing can be inferred from it as to *public* or *social* worship." (P. 34.)

Mr Parry next adduces some evidence of the practice of the apostles which Mr Wakefield has omitted:—

"These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren." (Acts i. 14.) "They unanimously persevered in prayer; and there can be no reasonable doubt entertained but this was *social* prayer. . . . . Can it be supposed that the apostles and the other disciples, like the Jewish hypocrites, ostentatiously used *solitary* prayer in the presence of one another, against the precept of their Lord? Or, if it were admitted that they did, where would there have been that *unanimity* in prayer which is so emphatically spoken of in the text?" (P. 35.)

"And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." (Acts ii. 42.)*—"And when they heard that, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord," &c. (Acts iv. 24.)*—"But we will give ourselves unto prayer, and to the ministry of the word." (Acts vi. 4.)—"And when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them." (Acts vi. 6.)*—"Prayer was made without ceasing of the church unto God for him." (Acts xii. 5.)—"Many were gathered together praying." (Acts xii. 12.)—"And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." (Acts xiii. 3.)*—"And when he (Paul) had thus spoken, he kneeled down, and prayed with them all." (Acts xx. 36.)—"Why," asks Mr Parry, "did not Mr Wakefield refer to this passage? This is 'pointed, unequivocal, and pertinent' to the subject; and, I will add, decisive against his position." (P. 40.)

"And they brought us on our way, with wives and children, till we were out of the city; and we kneeled down on the shore, and prayed." (Acts xxi. 5.)

* These passages are *referred to*, and briefly remarked upon, by Mr Wakefield. I have *quoted* them above, p. 275.

He quotes also Rom. xv. 30; 1 Cor. xi. 13, xiv. 13-17, 23; 2 Thess. iii. 1, 2; 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2, 8; James v. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 7.

"Thus it appears," he adds, "there is abundant evidence in the New Testament, that social and public worship was practised among the apostles and the earliest Christians. And the *incidental* manner in which their worship is spoken of, or referred to, in the Acts and Epistles, instead of weakening, *strengthens* the argument in support of the practice; because it involves in it this obvious but important idea, that social and public worship was their *general* and *uniform* practice. It could not therefore be reasonably expected, that the mention of it in the Scriptures should be more explicit or more frequent than we find it to be. Common practices are not referred to in any writings, otherwise than in such an incidental manner as particular circumstances or occasions may require the writer to notice things, which, in any other view, it would be impertinent or unnecessary to mention; but when so mentioned, it is evident they are *common practices*, and not deviations from the general conduct of the parties. The scriptures of the New Testament were written for the use of Christians who lived in the age when they were composed, and that immediately following it, as well as for those in the present day. Where then would have been the propriety of particularly narrating well-known facts and practices, which were continually taking place in every Christian family, and Christian assembly? Accidental, and even *oblique* references to ancient and established customs in the writers of antiquity, are in many cases more satisfactory evidence of their existence and general prevalence than direct and positive narrations would be. Accounts of the latter description might be suspected of fabrication. But when the proof of an ancient practice arises from the accidental mention of it, or an occasional reference to it in a contemporary writer or historian, the evidence comes in that *order* and *form* which might most naturally and reasonably be expected, and is therefore most convincing and indubitable." (Pp. 51, 52.)

Mr Parry's concluding section is "On the Nature and Design of Christianity." If the purposes of that religion are to purify and exalt believers, to separate them from that portion of the world which lieth in wickedness, and to unite them in the public profession of the Gospel, and the practice of love and holiness—will not this design be much better promoted if public worship be *not* excluded from Christian assemblies? "If, as Mr Wakefield recommends, the services of religious assemblies were confined to instruction, discussion, and disputation, would not a company of persons, met together only for such purposes, resemble an academic school rather than a Christian church united for the honour of God? Would not the distinction between the church of Christ and the world, which now falls greatly short of what it was in the apostolic times, be still farther impaired? And would not numbers who frequent such assemblies be in danger of losing the small degree of reverence they have for the Divine Being, instead of having it increased? Would not the disuse of public worship

also wear off from the minds of many a sense of the obligation of worshipping God at all? And would it not thus, in an insensible manner, introduce more practical atheism than now exists?" (P. 61.)

The author concludes by pointing out the tendency of social worship to promote at once the honour of God, the improvement of mankind, and the religious advancement and edification of the worshippers.

310. EVANSON, EDWARD, M.A. (*born* 1731; *died* 1805).—Arguments *against* and *for* the Sabbatical Observance of Sunday by a Cessation from all Labour, contained in the Letters of sundry writers in the Theological Repository; with an additional Letter to Dr Priestley, in continuation of the same subject. Ipswich, 1792. 8vo. Pp. 175.

This is a collection of controversial letters, of which all but the concluding one had appeared in the last six numbers of Dr Priestley's *Theological Repository*, published at Birmingham in 1786 and 1788 (vol. v. p. 342, and vol. vi. pp. 22, 113, 331, 352, 366, 465). It contains, (1.) Observations on the Sabbath, by Eubulus, *i.e.*, Mr Evanson; (2.) A paper on the Observance of the Lord's Day, in answer to Eubulus, by Philander, *i.e.*, Dr Priestley; (3.) The Observance of the Lord's Day vindicated, in Remarks on Eubulus, by Subsidiarius, a writer unknown; (4.) Objections to a Weekly Day of Rest, in reply to Philander, by Eubulus; (5.) Reply to Subsidiarius, by Eubulus; (6.) The Observance of the Lord's Day vindicated, by Hermas, who is Dr Priestley again; and (7.) A Letter to Dr Priestley, by Mr Evanson.

To the last of these Dr Priestley replied in his *Letters to a Young Man* (No. 311); and Mr Evanson briefly rejoined in *A Letter to Dr Priestley's Young Man* (Ipswich, 1794, 8vo, pp. 120).

Evanson's career resembled that of Mr Wakefield. He studied at Emmanuel College, Cambridge; and in 1768 and 1770 became Vicar of South Mimms and Rector of Tewkesbury. A change of theological opinion made him resign his livings in 1778; and in 1792 he published a work which gave great offence to the orthodox part of the community, entitled, *The Dissonance of the Four generally received Evangelists, and the Evidence of their respective Authenticity Examined; with that of other Scriptures deemed canonical.* It was answered by Dr Priestley in his *Letters to a Young Man*, Part II. (Lond. 1793), and also by Thomas Falconer, M.A., of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in the *Bampton Lectures* for 1810. But I do not find that he ever renounced Christianity itself, so as to merit the title of "infidel" (in the scriptural sense of the word), which was generally applied to him.*

* In the days of Jesus and his apostles, all who accepted him as the Messiah were accounted "believers." There was no question as to the

In the first of the articles above enumerated, he opposes, in the discharge of what he considers to be "the duty of a faithful disciple of Jesus Christ, and of a real friend to the welfare of his fellow-creatures," the religious observance of the first day of the week as a *Sabbath*, or day of cessation from all worldly business. The so-called Christian Sabbath he regards as "an institution which cannot be productive of any valuable ends, but such as are easily to be attained without it, and which not only occasions a loss to individuals and to the community at large of one-seventh part of the industry of manufacturers and labourers of every kind, but, what is infinitely more important, induces a very large majority of that most useful and most numerous part of the people to misspend that seventh of their time in dissipation and intemperance, which too naturally, and too certainly, lead them to vicious immoralities and crimes of every degree." (P. 14.)

He proceeds to contend that not only is there (as all admit) no positive precept in the New Testament for keeping a Sabbath, but no such duty can with reason be *inferred* from anything either in Scripture or in the works of the earliest post-apostolic Christian writers. He denies that we have any proof of the Lord's Day having been observed by the Apostles or other primitive Christians as a Sabbath. To admit that there is no *precept* on the subject is, he thinks, in effect to give up the point in dispute: "For surely, under any religious law whatsoever, to establish so important an institution as annihilates, at one stroke, the seventh part of all human industry, nothing less can be requisite than the express command of the lawgiver himself. And to him who recollects that the fatal apostacy from true Christianity, and the entire structure of idolatrous antichristian superstition which hath for so many ages usurped its place, were effected by means of fallacious inferences from particular passages of Scripture, and a zeal for magnifying the honour of the Messiah, the very mode of argument used in its defence will suggest strong suspicions of fallacy and error." (P. 16.)

He maintains that the Apostles and first disciples of Jesus Christ are nowhere said to have distinguished the first day of the week in any way whatsoever, and that the texts usually referred to (John xx. 19, 26; Acts xx. 6, 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2; Rev. i. 10) are quite inadequate to establish that conclusion. His arguments on this subject are mainly those employed by Heylin, Milton, the Seventh-day Baptists, and others. (See above, i. 158, 181; ii. 51, 198–202, 261.) In two of the passages, Acts xx. 7, &c., and 1 Cor. xvi. 2,

inspiration or authority of the Hebrew Scriptures, nor do the Gentile converts appear to have been expected—far less required—to acknowledge their divine origin. In regard to the New Testament Scriptures, it is evident that as these were not written till afterwards, none of the earliest believers *could* have any opinion whatever about them. Since Evanson's time the subject of his treatise on the Evangelists has been much more adequately discussed. One of the most valuable contributions to our knowledge of it is the work of Mr Smith of Jordanhill on *The Origin and Connection of the Gospels*; Edin. 1853.

he finds not only *no proof* of the opinion controverted, but *positive arguments against it.* The meeting spoken of in Acts xx. was, says he, "evidently in the very beginning of the first day of the week, that is, in the evening, after the business of the preceding day was over. And if their 'coming together to break bread' means their participating of the Lord's Supper, as from the general term 'the disciples' is highly probable, it shows us that St Paul thought it better to use the evening for the purpose of celebrating that sacred institution, as well as of instruction, than to break in upon the daily occupations of the Gentile converts. And as the historian assures us that he both intended and did actually set out on his journey at break of day, this passage of Scripture affords us a decisive proof that St Paul had no idea of keeping the first day of the week as a Sabbath." (Pp. 17, 18.) Again: "In Acts xx. 7, the historian, by mentioning the purpose of the assembly of the disciples, informs us clearly also of the time of the day when it was held; for, he tells us, it was 'to break bread.' That is, it was either to partake of one common farewell-meal with the Apostle before his departure, or else to celebrate together with him the Lord's Supper. If it was the first, all writers, both sacred and profane, teach us that the customary time of their chief and only fixed meal was in the evening, on the beginning of the Jewish day. If the latter, still, from what St Paul writes to the Corinthians upon that subject, we know it was, in those days, celebrated, according to its first institution, in the evening, at the hour of 'supper.' If, therefore, this breaking bread of the disciples was, as St Luke assures us it was, 'on the first day of the week,' it must have been on our Saturday evening; for the next evening would have been, according to the Jewish computation of time, on the second day. And I leave it to any person of common sense, who has read the passage, to judge whether St Paul preached to them one whole night, and set out on his journey on Sunday at break of day, as I understand him to have done; or whether he continued to preach to them two whole nights and the intervening day, and set out on Monday morning, as Philander and his auxiliary suppose. Subsidiarius indeed avoids the absurdity of so preposterous a predication, by making the disciples assemble on Sunday evening; but as the hour of 'breaking bread' on our Sunday evening was on the second day of the week, and not the first, he thereby flatly contradicts St Luke, and, if he could be right, the assembly would have no reference to the subject of the present debate. As to the difficulty which he suggests about the word 'morrow,' the quibble would really have amazed me, if I did not well know the omnipotence of habitual prejudice. I only beg that gentleman will take the trouble of reading the first six verses of the fourth chapter of the very same history, and he will there find the same word 'morrow' indisputably used twice, in opposition to the preceding evening, though, with the Jews, the evening and the morning were the same day." (Pp. 96, 97.) And in the injunction to the Corinthians to lay by them in store, on the first

day of the week, *as God had prospered them*, he finds implied "a direction to every disciple of those times to settle his accounts on that day for the preceding week, that he might proportion his contribution to the state of his circumstances—a business quite incompatible with the idea of a Sabbath-day." (P. 18.)

By Dr Priestley and "Subsidiarius," however, not only is the justice of these inferences disputed (the latter of them being indeed obviously strained, while the former is admitted by at least one eminent Sabbatarian to be well founded*), but they persist in maintaining the soundness of their own opposite conclusion from the passages under discussion. Mr Evanson's final rejoinder as to those in Acts xx. and 1 Cor. xvi. is somewhat pungent:—"If the arguments deduced from the two passages in my former letters are not sufficiently intelligible, as I must suppose from your manner of replying to them, I have to regret that it is not in my power to make them more so. But I would as soon misspend my time in attempting to prove that the sun shone at noon-day, to a person who should persist in affirming it to be then midnight darkness, as I would contend with any one who will assert, that an express precept for a man to lay by money *in his own custody*, signifies that he should deposit it *in the custody of another person*,—or who, well knowing that, in the times of the apostles, the hour of assembling together, both for their ordinary chief meal and for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, was in the evening, at the beginning of the Jewish day, persists in main-

* "The language of Acts xx. 7, 'On the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached to them, and continued his speech until midnight,' and, as afterwards appears, 'even till break of day,' most naturally leads our minds to the *evening* as the time of meeting. I am persuaded that, in this case, it was so;—that the remarkable incident recorded as the consequence of Paul's long preaching, the historian means to say, took place at that particular time of the day, when the disciples came together for the celebration of the Lord's Supper. I do not doubt that they had met before, at other times of the day; but if I were called to prove, in point of fact, that they had done so, I should feel myself at a loss for evidence." (*Discourses on the Sabbath*, by Ralph Wardlaw, D.D., p. 93.)

A plea for the opposite opinion may be seen in the Rev. T. S. Hughes's *Letter to Godfrey Higgins*, p. 37. He questions whether it was the practice of the Christians at Troas to observe the day from sunset to sunset; but as most of the Christians of that time were converted Jews or proselytes, I see no reason to doubt that they retained the national custom. Now that the text has been amended by the critical editors, however, so that it now stands, "*we* [*i.e.*, Paul and Luke, with their companions] being come together" (see above, i. 85, note), the question is no longer as to the assembling of disciples of Troas, but as to that of a company of travellers. Mr Hughes, it ought to be added, denies that, even *if* Paul travelled on a Sunday, he committed any offence in doing so. In that writer's opinion neither Paul nor the disciples of Troas kept the Sunday as a Sabbath; they were bound, he thinks, only to observe the day religiously, as he holds the patriarchs to have done, but not to rest wholly from labour upon it. On this point he advocates the view taken by Grotius, as mentioned above, vol. i. p. 221.

taining that a predication which St Luke informs us took place at that particular time did not commence then, but at an hour when they never assembled for those purposes. I will, therefore, only remark, on the latter instance, that I am sorry to appear so ignorant to Dr Priestley as not to have known that amongst the Jews, as in every other nation, the word *day* was used sometimes to denote the periodical revolution of twenty-four hours; at others, to express *daylight*, in opposition to darkness or night. I am sure the force of my argument required that it should be so understood. And I only quoted the beginning of Acts iv. to convince Subsidiarius, whose head seemed to be prepossessed with modern English ideas, that though the word 'morrow,' or 'morning,' in our language signifies the next civil day, because our evening and subsequent morning are in different days, yet, amongst the Jews, when opposed to the preceding night or evening, it meant the same civil day, because, with them, the evening and following morning were in the same day.

"With respect to the passage quoted from the Epistle to the Corinthians, I must observe, that though I doubt not St Paul's exhortation, in this instance, being misunderstood by the Christians of after times, gave rise to their weekly collections both for charitable purposes and the defraying the necessary expenses incurred in the economy of their several assemblies, yet, in the times of the apostles themselves, no such custom was instituted. And the collection proposed by St Paul was not an usual practice, as Mr Locke and you, Sir, seem to imagine, but an extraordinary contribution, which St Luke tells us (Acts xi. 29) 'the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send,' to relieve the Christians of Judea under the pressure of that famine which the prophet Agabus had predicted would happen; and 'which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar.' And so far was the apostle from supposing, with you, that their destined contributions were deposited weekly in a charity-box, or in the hands of a treasurer, that in his Second Epistle, chap. ix., written a full year afterwards, he mentions same charitable contribution, hopes they are ready with it, and exhorts them to contribute liberally and cheerfully." (Pp. 155–157.)*

* Dr Priestley, in his *Letters to a Young Man*, p. 59, acknowledges that the Greek phrase παρ' ἑαυτῷ in 1 Cor. xvi. 2, if understood in its usual sense, must imply that the money was to be kept in the private custody of the benefactors; but he is so possessed by the idea, which has been shown to be groundless (above, p. 179), that the purpose for which Paul wrote could not have been answered by this method, and so influenced by the fact that in later times collections were made in assemblies on the first day of the week, that he is driven to the conjecture, "either that the Apostle did not express himself accurately, or that the common is not the universal sense of the phrase." He adds, however, that "very little depends upon this passage with regard to the main argument; and Mr Evanson's reasoning would have no less force if it was unmixed with such contempt for that of his adversary."

Mr Evanson urges further, that while, on the one hand, as we have said, no passages of Scripture can be produced which, even by inference, recommend to Christians the keeping of the first day of the week sacred as a Sabbath-day,—on the other hand, we find passages which expressly teach that the Gospel does *not* require of its disciples any such observance. Those which he specifies and comments upon are Acts xv. 28, 29, and Gal. iv. 9–11.

"On this footing," he proceeds, "stands the state of the question, so far as the books of the New Testament are concerned. And since the arguments in favour of the observance are so far from finding any support from that quarter, a man unacquainted with those writings of the Christians of the first three centuries which have been permitted to reach our hands would naturally conclude that they, at least, were clear and full in ascertaining the fact that the first day of the week was, in their times, kept as a Sabbath by all the professors of Christianity. How then must such an one be astonished when he finds, what is strictly true, that, instead of informing us such a Sabbath was kept, they expressly assure us that neither had the Gospel enjoined, nor did they practise, any such observance! Nay, they go farther; and as St Paul argued against the necessity of circumcision, because the blessings of the Christian covenant were promised to Abraham and his seed after him whilst he was yet uncircumcised, so they adopt a similar argument to prove that Sabbath-keeping could not be a duty of the Gospel, because the promises of the Gospel were given to Abraham, and repeated to all the patriarchs, though they kept no Sabbath, but lived several centuries before the command for keeping the Sabbath was given. [See above, p. 64.] It is true they inform us that Christians in their times used to assemble together on the first day of the week—a custom probably introduced by St Paul's recommending it to the Corinthians to settle their accounts for the preceding week, and to deposit their quotas of the charitable collections on that day. And as our Lord had enjoined upon his disciples to commemorate him by a common participation of bread and wine, it seems necessary that some stated time should be fixed for that purpose. But in the first and purest ages of Christianity their meetings were short, and either very early in the morning, before the usual hours of business, after which they departed, each to his several daily occupation, or else in the evening, after all the business of the day was ended. It was not till the reign of Constantine, that is, till the fourth century of the Christian era, that the first day of the week was ordered to be kept sacred as a Sabbath-day. And it is curious to remark that that prince, whose profession and establishment of what was then, very falsely, called Christianity, appears to have been entirely political, enjoined the sabbatical cessation from business only upon the cities and large towns, and could not be prevailed upon to extend the order to the villages and country in general, no doubt providently apprehending that the suppression of agriculture and other rural occupations for one-seventh of the year might, in

some seasons be, at least locally, attended with very fatal consequences. [See above, i. 121, 257.] The observance of a Sabbath, therefore, amongst Christians is founded upon no religious authority whatsoever, but was ordained solely by the interposition of the same civil power which laid the foundation of that idolatrous, blasphemous superstition which, though diametrically opposite to the religion of Jesus Christ, both in its principles and effects, hath for so many centuries superseded it in the West, and which, for wise reasons, the divine providence hath suffered to be supplanted in the East and South by the gross imposture of Mahomet." (Pp. 20–22.)

Against these propositions Dr Priestley brings evidence from the New Testament, which he "cannot but think sufficient to show that a day was set apart every week in the times of the apostles for religious purposes, that this was the Lord's Day, *and that no worldly business was done upon it.*

"To prove," he adds, "that the Lord's Day was observed in the same strictly religious manner in the following ages, prior to the days of Constantine, I have no need to quote passages from the writers of that period of time, this being already done to my hands by several,"—such as Pearson, King, Whitby, and Benson, to whose works he gives references. (P. 44.)

But in answer to this, it is emphatically denied by Mr Evanson that the ancient writers alluded to give any warrant for the conclusion that no worldly business was done upon the Lord's Day. On the contrary, "though they inform us" (as he freely admits) "of their assembling for religious purposes on the first day of the week, they expressly assert *that neither had the Gospel enjoined, nor did they practise, any such observance* as a Sabbath. If, therefore, Philander has never read the writings of the very few Christians of the second century whose works are come down to us, he was not qualified to argue upon the question; if he has, his pretending to conclude, in opposition to their own clear testimony, that they did observe a Sabbath, is unpardonable.

"However, to put the matter of fact out of all doubt with those readers who may not be acquainted with the writings of that early period, I will translate a few passages out of Justin the Martyr (who has given us a most explicit account of the time and purport of their religious assemblies, and everything transacted in them, and to whom all those commentators must refer whose opinions seem to pass for gospel with Philander).

"In his *Dialogue with Trypho* (p. 227, ed. Par.), he informs us, the Jew objected against the Christians that, 'though they boasted of the truth of their religion, and wished to excel other people, they differed in nothing from the heathen in their manner of living, because they neither observed festivals, nor Sabbaths, nor the rite of circumcision.'* To this objection, according to Philander's

* This passage will be found in Henry Brown's translation of Justin's *Dialogue*, p. 39; Camb. 1846. There is a slight verbal difference between the two versions of this and the subsequent passages.

state of the case, the Christian should have replied that it was not justly founded, so far as concerned the Sabbath, for that they did keep one,—only, for reasons peculiar to their religion, they had transferred it from the seventh to the first day of the week. But instead of this, Justin acknowledges the whole charge to be true, and sets himself to prove that, under the new law and universal covenant of the Gospel, the external signs of carnal circumcision and a temporal Sabbath were unnecessary, and incapable of answering the purposes of the new religion. 'There is now,' says he, p. 229, 'need of another kind of circumcision; and you think highly of that in your flesh. The new law will have you keep a perpetual Sabbath; and you, when you have passed one day in idleness, think you are religious, not knowing why that was commanded you. The Lord our God is not pleased with such things as these. If any among you is guilty of perjury or fraud, let him cease from those crimes; if he is an adulterer, let him repent, and he will have kept the kind of Sabbath truly pleasing to God.'* In p. 241, 'Do you see that the elements are never idle nor keep a Sabbath? Continue as you were created. For if there was no need of circumcision before Abraham, nor of the observation of the Sabbath and festivals and oblations before Moses, neither now likewise is there any need of them after Jesus Christ,' &c. † In p. 245, he says, 'Tell me, why did not God teach those to perform such things who preceded Moses and Abraham, just men, of great renown, and who were well pleasing to him, though they neither were circumcised nor observed Sabbaths?'‡ And p. 261, 'As, therefore, circumcision began from Abraham, and the Sabbath, sacrifices, and oblations from Moses, which, it has been shown, were ordained on account of your nation's hardness of heart, so, according to the council of the Father, they were to end in Jesus Christ the Son of God,' &c. §

"Other passages of the same purport might be quoted, not only from this writer, but also from Irenæus and Tertullian. (The former of whom, by the way, cites the very same passages that I have cited out of Exodus and Ezekiel || to prove that the Sabbath was at first ordained merely as a distinguishing sign of the Mosaic covenant, and not for any moral purpose, or for any reason which made it necessary to mankind in general.) But, I persuade myself, these are abundantly sufficient to convince Philander himself, and every candid reader, that the Christians of the second century did not observe, and consequently had not received, any such institution from the apostles of Jesus Christ and their immediate disciples; but, on the contrary, that they understood the doctrine of the Gospel (as it seems to me every unprejudiced reader of the Acts of the Apostles and St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians must do) to teach that the Sabbath, as well as circumcision, and every other Jewish ordinance, was abolished by the new covenant, and

* Brown's translation of Justin's *Dialogue*, p. 43. † Id. p. 63.
‡ Id. p. 70. § Id. p. 99. || Exod. xxxi. 13; Ezek. xx. 12, 20.

not unnecessary only, but improper to be adopted into the practice of the disciples of Jesus Christ." (Pp. 91-94.)*

The first two quotations made by Priestley from the early Fathers (p. 103 *et seq.*) are from the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, chapters 7 and 9. One of them contains an advice to hold religious meetings, but no mention of any day; while the other is the passage quoted and commented on above (vol. i. p. 119), and certain words in which Dr Priestley, with Archbishop Wake, renders "keeping the Lord's Day." He observes: "The Greek has the word ζωην; but as it is not in the Latin translation, and without it there is a better contrast to keeping the Sabbath mentioned immediately before, it is, I believe, universally considered as an interpolation. See the note of Cotelerius on the passage." (P. 103.) On which Mr Evanson remarks: "Even allowing the very unwarrantable liberty which you and other critics are pleased to take with the original, the passage expressly contradicts your assertion 'that they spent Sunday as Christians spend it now,' and directly confirms all that I have advanced upon the subject. For it declares that professed Christians of the writer's time did not keep any 'Sabbaths.' And, therefore, let what will be meant by the words 'keeping the Lord's Day,' as you translate them, they certainly cannot mean keeping it as a day of rest and cessation from all business, as Christians keep it now. For then the author's words would run, 'no longer observing Sabbaths, but observing every Lord's Day as a Sabbath;' an absurdity too great to be attributed to any writer. But pray, good Sir, by what rules of construction do you translate ζωντες κατα, 'keeping?' The only meaning of those two Greek words that I am acquainted with is 'living according to.' And if the word ζωην be allowed to be part of the original sentence, the phrase 'living according to the Lord's life,' viz., the spiritual life he now lives in heaven, is perfectly intelligible, and much of the same kind with what we meet with in several places of the canonical Epistles, particularly in that to the Colossians, chap. iii. But if the phrase 'living according to the Lord's Day' has any meaning at all, it is entirely beyond my comprehension." (Pp. 130, 131.)†

* Sir William Domville, who, in his first volume on the Sabbath, p. 273, &c., considers what Justin Martyr has left us on this subject in his *Dialogue with Trypho* and *Apology for the Christians* (see above, p. 4), puts the pertinent question, "How could he reason as he has done, in disputing with a Jew, if it was in the power of the Jew to reply, 'Why, then, do you make a Sabbath of your Sunday?'"

† Mr Wakefield, in his *General Reply to the Arguments against the Enquiry into Public Worship*, p. 28, agrees with Priestley in thinking that the word ζωην has probably come into the text from the margin; "but whoever placed it in the margin," he adds, "understood the genius of the Greek language better than either the Doctor or Archbishop Wake. In the phrase κατα κυριακην ζωντες, the substantive ζωην is included in the participle, to the confusion of the argument constructed on these words." But to discuss the phraseology of writings so extensively corrupted, cannot be of much use to either side of the controversy.

Dr Priestley's next authority is the well-known passage in Justin's *Apology* (quoted above, p. 4), concerning which he observes: "This is certainly very similar to the account that any person would now give of Christians spending the Lord's Day. Nothing is said of this business being transacted in the morning or evening only; so that we cannot but conclude that it was done in mid-day; and it must have taken up a considerable part of it. The Lord's Day had not the appellation of *a Sabbath*, nor was it *a fast*, but it was always called *a festival;* and both with the heathens and the Jews festival days were no more employed in labour than fast days, though on them they were at liberty to work if they pleased." (Pp. 104-105.) Mr Evanson answers: "What different inferences and conclusions do different persons draw from the same premises! Justin's account informs us of only one religious meeting held on Sunday by Christians of his time, whereas, in our times, they assemble twice, and some three times, on that day." Far from taking up a considerable part of the day, the business described by Justin as being transacted at the meetings appears to Mr Evanson to be nothing beyond what may be reasonably supposed to have usually occupied an hour and a half at the utmost. The practice also differed from that of the moderns, in so far as it dispensed with singing, and comprised the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper—*this* part of the proceedings being, moreover, a proof that the assemblies were held in the evening, and hence "could not at all interfere with the usual business of the day." (Pp. 132-135.) The remaining and less important passages adduced by Priestley are from the pretended Barnabas, from Tertullian, Dionysius of Corinth, and Clement of Alexandria. (See pp. 105, 106.)*

* One of the extracts from Clement is the following passage in his *Stromata*, vii. p. 877, ed. Potter: Ουτος εντολην την κατα ευαγγελιον διαπραξαμενος, κυριακην εκεινην την ημεραν ποιει. οτ' αν αποβαλλη φαυλον νοημα, και γνωσικον προσλαβη, την εν αυτω του Κυριου αναστασιν δοξαζων. Which is translated by Priestley (p. 106) as follows: "A true Christian, *according to the commands of Christ*, observes the Lord's Day, by casting out all evil thoughts, and entertaining all good ones, glorifying the resurrection of the Lord on that day." This version has the fault of ambiguity at least, because it may be understood as making Clement say that Christ had commanded his followers to observe the Lord's Day, though Priestley probably meant the words in italics to apply to "a true Christian," and not to "observes the Lord's Day." In fact, Christ is not here named at all by Clement. Sir William Domville gives a correct translation of the passage thus: "He who fulfils the command according to the Gospel, makes that a Lord's Day in which he casts aside every evil thought," &c. (*The Sabbath*, i., 244). Both Evanson and Wakefield point out an unquestionable mistake in Priestley's translation, namely, his rendering of ἐν αὐτῷ by the words "on that day." (Evanson, p. 136, and Wakefield's *General Reply*, p. 28.) Mr Wakefield thinks it plain that "the Doctor followed the Latin translation, from an inability to apprehend the original: *in ipso* will refer to *diem* in the Latin, but ἐν αὐτῷ will not refer to ἡμέραν in the Greek." Mr Holden's version of the passage avoids the former fault, but includes the latter, besides substituting, as Priestley's also does, the phrase,

"But why," proceeds Mr Evanson, "do I waste my own and the reader's time in remarks upon passages which have no reference to the only question that I am at all concerned in, viz., Whether the keeping Sunday as a Sabbath, or day of rest from all worldly business, be an institution of Jesus Christ or his Apostles, and, consequently, the religious duty of a Christian? The only inference which you yourself, Sir, deduce from them is, that the first day of the week, or, as you are pleased to denominate it, 'the Lord's Day, had not the appellation of a Sabbath,' or day of rest, 'but was always called a festival;' and on festivals, you tell us, 'both the heathens and Jews were at liberty to work if they pleased.' Surely this is granting everything that I contended for! For nothing can be more evident than that, if the Apostles of Jesus Christ had, by their example and precept, enjoined upon their disciples a cessation from all worldly labour on that day, as Philander, and Subsidiarius, and yourself, in other parts of your letter, maintain, to keep it strictly as a Sabbath must have been an indispensable duty; and no Christian could have been at liberty to work on it, though he had wished to do so." (Pp. 136, 137.)

With regard to the law of Constantine about Sunday, Dr Priestley, by the way in which he accounts for the exception it makes of agricultural labour, shows that he had never looked at the edict itself. "It is well known," says he, "that people who live in villages and country places are the last to change their opinions and practices. This circumstance will furnish a much better reason than that assigned by Eubulus for Constantine's not extending his order to suspend their worldly business on the Lord's Day to those places. If the views of that prince were entirely political, his conduct may much more justly be ascribed to a dread of exciting discontents." (P. 61.) In reply to which, Mr Evanson refers to that clause in the ordinance where the uncertainty of the weather is *expressly assigned* as the reason for the exception. (See the edict, above, i. 257.) He adds the remark, that "the partial manner in which Constantine enjoins a cessation from their ordinary business upon his subjects, demonstrates that he knew of no previous ordinance of such an observance derived from the apostles of Christ: for that, like all other ordinances of the Gospel, must have been equally obligatory on all Christians whatsoever; and therefore he could have had no more right, in that case, to remit the observance to his country subjects from motives of good policy, than any ruler of the Jews had to dispense with the obligation of the Fourth Commandment of the Mosaic law in favour of the Jewish husbandmen." (Pp. 139, 140.)

In fact, "it was not till near a century and a half afterwards,

"keeps the Lord's Day," for "*makes that a Lord's Day*,"—which meaning is pointedly expressed in the Greek. It runs thus:—"He who hath executed the precepts of the Gospel (*i.e.*, he who is a true Christian) keeps the Lord's Day when he casts away evil thoughts, and entertains wise and good ones, glorifying the resurrection of the Lord on that day." (*The Christian Sabbath*, p. 298.)

'that, in obedience to a second imperial decree, in the reign of Leo,* professed Christians *spent Sunday in the same manner as it is generally spent amongst us.* And since, in consequence of the division of the empire, the decrees of the eastern emperor Leo did not bind the Christians of the west; we find the council of Orleans, in the sixth century, in their 28th canon, decreeing as follows:† 'Because people are persuaded that they ought not to travel on the Lord's day with horses, oxen and carriages, nor to prepare anything for food, nor to employ themselves in any way conducing to the cleaning and adorning their houses or persons, a persuasion which is proved to be fitter for Judea than for the observance of Christians, we ordain that those things are lawful to be done, as they have heretofore been lawful.' With ideas indeed very different from those of Constantine, the council proceeds to determine, that people should abstain from those works of husbandry which usually occupy the whole day, 'that they might be at leisure to come to church for the purpose of public prayer.' But that religious duty performed, they are left at liberty to employ the rest of the day as they pleased. In no nation of Europe therefore, except our own, nor even in that till since the reign of Charles II., has the Sunday Sabbath been kept in the rigid manner in which the Emperor Leo decreed, and the Puritans of later years preached up its observance." (Pp. 153–155.)

Considering the ability and learning which Mr Evanson displays in the theological and historical parts of this controversy, it is surprising that he should be so ignorant of human nature as to regard the observance of a weekly day of rest as occasioning "a loss to the community of one-seventh part of the industry of manufacturers and labourers of every kind" (see above, p. 292). To his objection on that head Dr Priestley replies:—"In my opinion, the cessation from labour on the Lord's Day makes a pleasing and useful distinction in our time; and, besides its excellent religious and moral uses, greatly contributes to the civilization of mankind. The expectation of it relieves the labour of all the preceding six days; and consequently that labour is done better with this interval than it would have been without it, to say nothing of the relief that it affords the labouring cattle.

"Besides, I cannot help thinking that in this country the manufacturers labour to excess; and that it would be very desirable, would contribute to lengthen their lives, and make their lives much happier, if their labours could be moderated. The riches of this nation are procured by the premature exhausting of the strength and vital powers of the greater part of our manufacturers; though it is not denied that the intemperance of many of them contributes to the same effect. Like our horses, their lives are shortened, and made wretched, by fatigue.

* "Corp. Jur. Civ. Cod. lib. 3, tit. 12, l. 11." Mr Evanson transcribes the original decree.

† "Concil. Aurel. iii. c. 28;" which he quotes in the original Latin.

"If the *law* did not provide intervals of rest from labour, the labourers themselves would not fail to do it; and the intervals of their own providing would have a worse effect than the present. Our annual feasts, in every town and village in the kingdom, are far more mischievous than Sunday spent in the worst manner. For no ideas of religion being now annexed to them, licentiousness has no restraint." (Pp. 117, 118.)

Both Priestley and Paley, however (see above, p. 249), fall short of Michaelis (above, pp. 216, 225; see also p. 169) in furnishing a thorough reply to the objection. The fact is now familiar to most people, that neither man nor the labouring animals can work hard every day without such loss of strength, that, even apart from the consideration of the shortening of their lives, it is *more economical* to let them enjoy a weekly day of rest. Not only Moses, but other ancient legislators, seem to have been aware of this (see above, pp. 65, 197).

The inducement which the leisure of the sabbatically-observed Sunday gives to indulgence in drunkenness and other vices, weighs much with Mr Evanson in making him denounce the institution as in itself pernicious and impolitic. "How small a part of the great bulk of the people," says he, "have either inclination or ability to employ the weekly returns of sabbatical idleness in what are called religious exercises and meditations; even if there were any real benefit in so doing! Look round amongst those higher orders of men, whose situations and circumstances afford them the greatest share of leisure-time; and though they, for the most part, have had the great advantages of a liberal education, observe how few of them employ their leisure to any valuable purpose; and how many abuse it, to their own and others' detriment. Who then can think it possible, that the uninformed minds of the illiterate and ignorant can wisely and virtuously spend one-seventh part of their lives in idleness, or rather, that great numbers of them should not misspend it, as we find they do, to the corruption of their own morals, and the insecurity and annoyance of society in general? That admirable, perfect model of prayer to the Deity, taught us by our Lord himself, contains but four petitions that personally respect ourselves; and one of them is, *that we may not be led into temptation*. A petition which evidently enjoins upon us, as an essential duty of our religion, the doing our utmost to preserve both ourselves and our fellow-creatures from falling into so perilous a situation. Whereas the calling off the labouring orders of men from their usual honest occupations, and obliging them to pass every seventh day in an idleness which many of them cannot but misspend, is forcing them into a weekly state of the most dangerous temptation; the consequence of which must be, what we experimentally find it, especially in all populous places, a most fatal depravity of their morals. And, I have no doubt, it was for this very reason that the religion of the Gospel enjoins upon its professors no sabbatical cessation from business, nor festival seasons of any kind." (Pp. 23, 24; see also pp. 84, 166.)

He finds proof of this evil influence in the fact, that so many criminals die "testifying that they owe their ruin to what they ignorantly call Sabbath-breaking;" and in the efforts made by benevolent persons to establish Sunday schools, where the children of the labouring people, instead of lounging away the day in childish pastimes, or misspending it in doing mischief, may employ it in the acquisition of some useful knowledge. (Pp. 11, 26.)

Among the Jews, he thinks, the bad effects which with us attend the observance of a Sabbath were obviated by the rigid manner in which the duty was enjoined, and the severe punishment of every act of disobedience. He affirms that "not only all business and travelling, but all social pleasurable intercourse with each other, was prohibited; and each family was, in a manner, circumscribed within the limits of its own dwelling, except during the hours of attendance at the temple or in the synagogue. And if modern legislators will persist in establishing by law a similar cessation from the ordinary occupations of civil life, and really wish to prevent the immoral and pernicious abuses of the idleness they alone ordain, they should imitate also the rigid severity of the Jewish law, and (if they think it right, or even practicable) punish every offender with death." (P. 85.)

Were it *true* that by the law of Moses the Jews were prohibited from all social pleasurable intercourse, and other means of harmless recreation and enjoyment, on the Sabbath, there might be some ground for attributing to it the demoralizing tendency which Mr Evanson thinks that, but for the rigour of the law, it would have had. But Dr Priestley informs him that the supposed prohibition is nowhere to be found in the law of Moses, and that, so far from recognising anything like it there, the Jews in all ages have made choice of the Sabbath in preference to other days for their social entertainments,—"putting on," as Reland says, "their best clothes in honour of it, and using every expression of joy, especially in feasting, and indulging themselves as well as they can afford."* Dr Priestley refers to the dining of Jesus with what appears to have been a large party in the Pharisee's house on a sabbath-day (Luke xiv. 1, &c.), and quotes proof from the Fathers that, in their time, the Lord's Day was observed as a festival.† Mr Evanson, however (pp. 158–165), persists in his opinion, and, tacitly assuming that festivity is in its very nature demoralizing, concludes that if Priestley be in the right, "the Almighty himself could not

* *Antiquitates Sacræ*, Par. IV., cap. viii., sect. 10.

† As to feasting on the Sabbath, see above, i. 204, 216, 229, 240, 241; ii. 19, 130, 219. In regard to Sabbath-recreation, many find nothing against it in the law of Moses, and some even think that as a means of that "refreshment" which is an express purpose of the Sabbath (Exod. xxiii. 12; Deut. v. 14), it is by implication recommended to the Jews. See above, i. 171, 186, 192, 206, 216, 240, 267; ii. 13, 112, 124, 160, 164, 197, 207, 216, 221, 227, 247. On the question, whether a whole day can properly be spent in devotional exercises, see i. 172, 184; ii. 15, 25, 33, 76, 130, 152, 188, 207, 217. The festive character of the Lord's Day is noticed in ii. 55, 154; see also Baxter's *Pract. Works*, ix. 282.

have devised an institution more effectually tending to corrupt and deprave the morals of such a creature as he hath made man; and that all blame and punishment of that people for their immoralities, and particularly for their pollution of the Sabbaths, would have been unreasonable and unjust." (P. 158.) He questions whether the meal in the Pharisee's house was more than a mere mid-day refreshment after coming from the synagogue; quotes Isa. lviii. 13 as hostile to social enjoyment; and argues, that since the Jews were enjoined to "keep the Sabbath *holy*," they could not, consistently with the spirit of this law, make it a day of festive mirth and conviviality. (P. 163.) But in reply to this latter argument, reference has often been very pertinently made to Neh. viii. 9–12, where we see that feasting and merriment were recommended to the Jews by Nehemiah, Ezra, and the Levites, *on the express ground that the day spoken of was "holy to the Lord;"* besides that among all ancient nations, the Jews not excepted, the religious holidays were festivals. (See above, p. 195, and the places there referred to; also the texts referred to in vol. i. p. 34, note §.) That, in the case of the Jewish weekly Sabbath, the *entire day* was meant to be spent in feasting and amusement, there is no necessity for supposing. In fact, it *was not* usually so spent: the Jews had, and have, sufficient common sense to guide them in this as in other matters; and, while spending a portion of the day in refreshing themselves with social intercourse, walking in fields and gardens, and festive eating and drinking, they have, ever since the Captivity, devoted a part of it also to the study of their law,—to contemplation of the works of God,—and to the performance of devotional exercises, in private, in the temple, and, at least in later times, in synagogues.* If, then, the Jews

* In his *Letters to a Young Man*, Dr Priestley says: "If Mr Evanson will take the pains to inform himself, he will find that notwithstanding the rigorous abstinence of the Jews from all labour, and even from lighting a fire on the Sabbath-day, they always did, and still do, continue to spend that day as a festival, and that they make entertainments on it in preference to other days. If he have not Reland's *Jewish Antiquities*, of which the late riots have deprived me, so that I cannot have recourse to that author at present, or if he suspect, as he evidently does, that I did not quote him *fairly*, let him look into Buxtorf's *Synagoga Judaica* [above, No. 71, chap. xv.], in which he will find a very copious account of the Jewish method of entertaining themselves on the Sabbath; or, if he make inquiry of any living Jew, he will find that my former account was perfectly correct. Cotelerius, in his note on the passage in [the pseudo-] Ignatius, quoted above, says, 'Certe in proverbium abiit Sabbatarius luxus;' *i.e.*, 'The luxury of the Sabbath became proverbial.' As luxury implies excess, it is certainly not to be justified on any day; but social and cheerful entertainments, such as are not improper on other days, are by no means inconsistent with the acts of religion required of the Jews on the Sabbath, or of Christians on the Lord's Day." (Pp. 59, 60.) It must be allowed that Mr Evanson (p. 165) with reason accuses Dr Priestley of inconsistency; for in his first answer to Eubulus, p. 28, he had expounded Isa. lviii. 13 as an exhortation or injunction to the Jews that "they were not to pursue their secular employments, to indulge themselves in taking

regarded festivity as not merely lawful, but agreeable to the spirit of their religion, they possessed in this belief a safeguard against vicious courses which is wanting where festive enjoyments on the Sabbath are branded as impious. In such a state of public opinion as that which exists in Puritan countries, it must happen that many who are led by healthy natural impulse to recreate themselves in modes deemed irreligious, have their consciences seared by habitual disobedience to a fancied law of God, while even those who recognise no such law are placed in the deteriorating position of persons setting public opinion at defiance. The sabbath-breaking to which so many malefactors (sometimes truthfully perhaps, but often hypocritically) have ascribed their lapse into crime, is not its profanation, in the Scriptural sense of the term, by *work*; but the drinking, gambling, profligacy, and evil communications, in which repose from labour gives opportunity to indulge,—which ought to be counteracted *as such*,—and to which they might be the more liable to give way, because already in some degree corrupted by the influences referred to.* The question

recreations and diversions, or to talk about matters of worldly business; in other words, they were to spend the day in nothing but religious meditation and devotional exercises." Such inconsistency is not uncommon in books on the Sabbath. Thus, Mr Irwin, who maintains that the sanctification of the day means its "separation to be used for the worship and service of God," quotes with approval the statement of Dean Trench in his work on the Miracles, p. 328, that the Sabbath "was the day which the Jews ordinarily selected for their festive meals: for the idea of the Sabbath among them was *not at all that of a day to be austerely kept, but the very contrary*. The practical abuse of the day was a turning of it into one of riot and excess." (See Irwin's *Observations on the Rev. Dr Reichel's Sermon entitled "The Lord's Day* NOT *the Sabbath,"* pp. 11, 42; Dublin, 1859.)

Dr Walæus, a celebrated professor of divinity at Leyden, whose opinions of the Sabbath are expressed in the Articles of the Synod of Dort on that subject, which appear to have been drawn up by him (see above, i. 218; ii. 3), as well as in his *Dissertatio de Sabbato* (above, i. 157), included in his *Works*, vol. i., and in his *Loci Communes Sacræ Theologiæ* (Lugd. Bat., 1640), is one of those who maintain the lawfulness of recreation and temperate ..sting on the Sabbath. (See p. 636 of the book last mentioned.) He quotes Neh. viii. 12 to show that public worship should *first* be performed. So far as I have observed, this passage of Scripture is never quoted by the Puritans or their followers in considering the Scriptural meaning of "keeping a day holy," though none is fitter to show us how that phrase was understood by the ancient Jews.

* See Domville, i. 152; and *Sabbath Laws*, pp. 55, 345–7. A writer in the *New Monthly Magazine* for June 1833 puts the matter strongly as follows:—"The religious tracts, and similar publications, dwell on no point so strongly as the danger of Sabbath-breaking. No wonder—a poor fellow must either go to church, or to sleep, to be safe. If he is not impressed with the importance of church-going,—if he finds the parson drowsy or incomprehensible, the congregation smart and proud, and, on the whole, decides upon staying away,—what is he to do? Every thing is dull—shut up—no sport allowed—restraint upon every movement—solemnity upon every face. Eaten up with ennui, he creeps into

has long been agitated, whether, in countries like Scotland and New England, where the Puritan notions and practice of Sabbath-observance are so strictly maintained, much of the prevailing immorality does not proceed from the denial of that wholesome excitement and amusement which in other parts of Christendom is regarded as legitimate, and powerful in preventing the outbreak of human nature in ways that are *truly* pernicious. The maxim of Burke, that "lawful enjoyment is the surest method to prevent unlawful gratification," is, if true, certainly one of great practical value.* King James complains, in his *Declaration of Sports* (No. 64;

some corner with a few fellows similarly situated, and resorts to gambling for amusement: or he collects his companions in some out-of-the-way beer-shop; or, perhaps, he and they loiter by dozens at the 'town-end,' lounging on walls and posts, corrupting each other with loose conversation, and insulting the passengers by indecent remarks; and all this because the ordinary channels of amusement are blocked up, in the vain hope of driving him, and such as him, without trouble, into the arms of Mother Church.' Vain hope! The fervour of the Dissenter who 'persuades' has done more to prevent Sabbath-breaking than all the laws that were ever made. The poor criminal, when reduced in prison to reflect upon the circumstances that have contributed to his fall, always has Sabbath-breaking put into his mouth, and he confesses the justice of the charge. No doubt: forbidden to work, forbidden to play, uninduced to go to church, he was driven to clandestine amusement and riotous companionship in secret. No one in France ever talks of Sabbath-breaking as the cause of crime: no, for though the day is a day of worship, it is also a day of pleasure; there is mass in the morning, but there is a dance at night; and thus youth and nature find a safety-valve: injudicious duties always lead to contraband trade." (Vol. xxxviii., p. 210.)

* Letter to Sir H. Langrishe, in *Works of Edmund Burke*, vi. 312, ed. 1823.

Captain Marryat, in his *Diary in America*, says: "Whether the Blue Laws of Connecticut are supposed to be still in force I know not, but I could not discover that they had ever been repealed. At present there is no theatre in Connecticut, nor does any body venture to propose one. The proprietors of one of the equestrian studs made their appearance at the confines of the State, and intimated that they wished to perform, but were given to understand that their horses would be confiscated if they entered the State. The consequence is that Connecticut is the dullest, most disagreeable State in the Union; and, if I am to believe the Americans themselves, so far from the morals of the community being kept uncontaminated by this rigour, the very reverse is the case—especially as respects the college students, who are in the secret practice of more vice than is to be found in any other establishment of the kind in the Union. But even if I had not been informed by credible people, I should have decided in my own mind that such was the case. Human nature is everywhere the same." (Vol. i. p. 241.) For *commercial* morality the reputation of Connecticut is low, and that of Puritan Scotland cannot be said to be very high! while the prevalence of drunkenness and incontinence in that part of the United Kingdom is now made known to all the world by statistical reports. The falsity of the common notion that Scotland was distinguished for morality during the sway of the ultra-sabbatarian Covenanters has already been shown above, p. 77.

above, i. 152), that the prohibition of the old Sunday recreations by the Puritan magistrates "barreth the common and meaner sort of people from using such exercises as may make their bodies more able for war when his Majesty or his successors shall have occasion to use them, *and in place thereof, sets up tippling and filthy drunkenness*, and breeds a number of idle and discontented speeches in their ale-houses; for when shall the common people have leave to exercise if not upon the Sundays and holy-days, seeing they must apply their labour and win their living in all working-days?" And Bishop Goodman, in his treatise on *The Fall of Man*, published a few years later (namely in 1624), laments that "the whole world is distracted with factions; and, therefore, sure the old time was much to be commended, in tolerating, or rather giving occasion to, some country May games or sports, as dancing, piping, pageants, all which did serve to assuage the cruelty of man's nature, that, giving him some little ease and recreation, they might withhold him from worser attempts, and so preserve amity between them. Upon the abolishing of these, you could not conceive in reason, were it not that we find it true by experience (for sometimes things which are small by the consideration are great in the practice), what dissolute and riotous courses, what unlawful games, what drunkenness, what envy, hatred, malice, and quarrelling have succeeded in lieu of these harmless sports! And these are the fruits which our strict professors have brought into the world! I know not how they may boast of their faith (for indeed they are pure professors!), but sure I am, they have banished all charity." (P. 207; quoted in Southey's *Commonplace Book*, p. 163, Lond. 1849.) The Long Parliament in 1647 recognised the need of recreation, in one of their ordinances, quoted above, vol. i. p. 235; but whether even the inadequate provision of a monthly day they made for it was attended to in practice, may well be doubted. The earlier English Puritans, such as the arch-sabbatarian Dr Bound himself, were well aware of the necessity of recreation (see above, i. 150); and his contemporary Greenham, though an enemy to *sports* on Sunday, taught, nevertheless, that then, "as it is a day of rejoicing, there is a more lawful liberty of speech, and a more liberal use of cheerful behaviour," than on other days, (above, i. 141). Archbishop Usher's opinion of recreation appears in page 262 of the same volume.

"No people," observes Mr Joseph Kay, late Travelling Bachelor of the University of Cambridge, "No people exist without some kind of amusement, or some means of relaxation or excitement. In one country they frequent ale and spirit houses; in another, shooting matches; in another, dances, fairs, and village festivals; in another, they amuse themselves with gardening; and in another, with healthy pastimes, such as cricket, foot-ball, and other games. The more hard-worked and degraded a peasantry is, the more degraded will invariably be their amusements,—the more invariably will they frequent the drinking-booths, and the less able and willing will they be to indulge in those healthier and more civilized

pleasures, which require more leisure-time, or a higher degree of civilization, for their enjoyment.

"In England it may be said that the poor have now no relaxation but the ale-house or the gin-palace. It is a sad thing to say of a people; but, alas! it is too true. The good old country games of the times of our forefathers are forgotten. The class of yeomanry, or small proprietors, which used to keep them up, have disappeared. The cricket matches, wrestling matches, running matches, shooting matches, and dances, which formed some of the healthy sports of our peasantry in former times, are now, as far as the peasantry are concerned, abandoned and forgotten; and the commons and greens where they were once held have been nearly all enclosed. Nor is this because our peasants have exchanged their healthy country pastimes for any of a more civilized character. They do not generally amuse themselves with gardening, for they have seldom any gardens. They do not practise music together, as they have no opportunities of learning it, and they are too poor to make it worth the while of good bands to travel among the villages, as is the case in Germany. It may therefore be said that, as a general rule, our peasants have no other amusement or relaxation than that unhealthy and demoralizing one—the tavern. There they acquire intemperate habits; there they spend a great part of the earnings of their families; there they excite one another to rick-burnings, to poaching, and to low debauchery; and there the younger men learn all kinds of immorality from the older and more hardened frequenters. . . .

"The habit of drunkenness pervades the masses of the operatives to an extent never before known in our country. The spare hours of the Sunday, and many of the week days, are spent in these *pleasure* houses."*

He goes on to show that in the western countries of continental Europe, the amusements of the poor are of a much healthier and higher order than among ourselves. In Germany the village inn is intended and used less for mere drinking than as a place for *meeting* and conversation; it is, so to speak, the village club, where, in the early part of the evening, the pastor may be seen among the members of his flock, partaking in the general enjoyment, sanctioning it by his presence, and contributing to secure the admirable propriety that prevails. It is well known, too, that in Germany musical education is universal among the people. Every child, says Mr Kay, learns to sing, to chaunt, to read music, and to dance, and the village bands are such as to please the ear of a people who can discriminate between good and imperfect performances. "This universal knowledge of, and cultivated taste for music, has given the peasants of Germany many innocent means of amusement in the long winter evenings, and has put within their reach pleasures

* *The Social Condition and Education of the People in England and Europe; showing the results of the Primary Schools, and the division of Landed Property in Foreign Countries.* By Joseph Kay, M.A., &c. Lond. 1850. Vol. i. pp. 231, 232.

of the most civilizing and of the most gratifying kind. It has improved the public services in the churches and chapels, and has given the peasants a greater interest in them, and additional motives for attending them. The singing and chaunting in the churches and chapels of Germany is more beautiful than any which can be heard in any other country. The whole congregation joins in this part of the service, and joins too as if it felt interested in it. The body of sound which is produced and managed by a German congregation is as remarkable as it is delightful and exhilarating. It is more like what one hears from Mr Hullah's assembled classes at his great performances in Exeter Hall than anything else I can remember. The effect is quite magical, to stand among the people upon the floor of a large church in Germany, and to hear the swell of the great volume of sound poured forth by hundreds of men, women, and children, all singing together, without leaders, in perfect unison. People educated as these are, are not able to find pleasure in such coarse gratifications as those which satisfy the frequenters of our gin-palaces." (Pp. 236, 237.)*

Mr Kay further mentions, that in the suburbs of all the towns of Prussia and Saxony regular concerts and promenades are held, to which a fee of from a penny to sixpence admits persons of every rank. The "pleasure-houses" where these take place are situated in shady gardens: the upper storey is used for indoor concerts in bad weather, and for balls; while on the ground-floor are refreshment-rooms for the supply of coffee, tea, beer, wine, and cakes. Outside, hundreds of small tables and chairs are arranged under the trees and alcoves of the garden. "The band sits on a raised kind of stage in the middle of the garden, while around it in every direction, as far as the music can be distinctly heard, sit thousands of people of all ranks and conditions, listening to the performance of the most splendid compositions of the great masters of Germany. Nobles and peasants, officers and privates, merchants and shop-

* All this is quite natural in the country of Luther. "Music," says he in his *Table Talk*, "is one of the fairest and most glorious gifts of God, to which Satan is a bitter enemy; therewith many tribulations and evil cogitations are hunted away. . . . Music is the best solace for a sad and sorrowful mind, through which the heart is refreshed and settled again in peace. . . . Music is an half discipline and schoolmistress, that maketh people more gentle and meek-minded, more modest and understanding. . . . I always loved music; whoso hath skill in this art, the same is of good kind, fitted for all things. . . . . Music is a fair gift of God, and near allied to divinity; I would not for a great matter be destitute of the small skill in music which I have. The youth ought to be brought up and accustomed to this art, for it maketh fine and expert people. . . . Whoso contemneth music (as all seducers do) with them I am not content; next unto *Theologia*, I give the place and highest honour to *Musica*: for thereby all anger is forgotten, the devil is driven away, unchastity, pride, and other blasphemies, by music are expelled." He says also: "Our loving Lord God is willing that we eat, drink, and be merry, and make use of his creatures: for therefore he hath created them." (*Captain Bell's Translation*, pp. 500, 501, 51; Lond. 1652.)

keepers, old and young, rich and poor, sit there mixed up together, with their wives and daughters, smoking their cigars, drinking their coffee or beer, and listening to the music. In the intervals they stroll up and down in the shelter of the trees, rich and poor enjoying themselves together. In these pleasure-gardens of Germany there is very little excess. The people do not meet to drink, but to hear music, and to see and talk to one another. The rich do not feel disgusted to sit at a table next to one occupied by a poor man's family, because the poor man is too well bred, too well mannered, and too neatly dressed, to cause the rich man or his family any annoyance. Whilst the band plays, the most perfect silence is preserved by the crowds assembled, except when it is broken by a murmur of approbation at the finer passages, showing always how genuine is the pleasure, and how good the taste and appreciation of the multitudes present.

"These pleasure-gardens are to be found in every village. In the neighbourhood of the large towns there are always very large ones, so situated in the prettiest villages and spots around as to command the finest views. . . . I went constantly to the garden concerts. I rejoiced to see that it was possible for the richest and the poorest of the people to find a common meeting-ground; that the poor did not live for labour only, and that the schools had taught the poor to find pleasure in such improving and civilizing pleasures."

Moreover, in most of the towns of Germany and Switzerland, public promenades have been made and planted with avenues of trees, under which the citizens stroll or sit on the summer evenings, chatting, listening to the bands which play on the promenade, reading and talking over the newspapers, drinking coffee or beer at some of the many refreshment-rooms always erected near, and enjoying life and the society of their fellows. These resorts are by no means used exclusively by the wealthier classes, as almost all amusements are in England; but mingled up with the richer classes on week-days, and especially on Sunday evenings, may be always seen crowds of the lower classes, with their wives and children, enjoying themselves at least as much as any of their richer neighbours.

"Can it be contended," asks Mr Kay, "that such an association as this can possibly exist, without exercising a great humanizing and civilizing influence over the less educated and poorer classes of society?" (Pp. 237–241.)*

* He gives an equally pleasing account of those rural merry-makings, of which there are several in each German village during the summer and autumn (p. 241, *et seq.*); and adds, that "the total absence of intemperance and drunkenness at these, and indeed at all other fêtes in Germany, is very singular. I never saw a drunken man either in Prussia or Saxony, and was assured by every one that such a sight was rare. I believe the temperance of the poor to be owing to the civilizing effects of their education in the schools and in the army; to the saving and careful habits which the possibility of purchasing land, and the

In the British Islands there is a wide diversity of opinion as to the lawfulness of devoting any portion of Sunday to these and similar modes of recreation. On the one hand, those who hold the Puritan opinion taught in the Westminster Catechism,—that the Lord's Day is the Sabbath, and that it "is to be sanctified by a holy resting *all that day*, even from such worldly employments *and recreations* as are lawful on other days, and spending *the whole time* in the public and private exercises of God's worship, except so much as is to be taken up in the works of necessity and mercy,"—condemn all such practices as sinful in themselves, and indirectly pernicious by effacing the good impressions received at church; while others, admitting that the Lord's Day is the Sabbath, hold that the Sabbath-observance required by the Puritans is without foundation in reason, in the precepts of Scripture, or in the example of even the holiest personages whose lives are there recorded. "An entire day," says Bishop Horsley, "is a longer space of time than the human mind can employ with alacrity upon any one subject. The austerity, therefore, of those is little to be commended, who require that all the intervals of public worship, and whatever remains of the day after the public duty is satisfied, should be spent in the closet, in private prayer, and retired meditation. Nor are persons in the lower ranks of society to be very severely censured—those especially who are confined to populous cities, where they breathe a noxious atmosphere, and are engaged in unwholesome occupations, from which, with their daily subsistence, they derive their daily poison—if they take advantage of the leisure of the day to recruit their wasted strength and harassed spirits, by short excursions into the purer air of the adjacent villages, and the innocent recreations of sober society; provided they engage not in schemes of dissipated and tumultuous pleasure, which may disturb the sobriety of their thoughts, and interfere with the duties of the day. . . . . The Sabbath was ordained for a day of public worship, and of refreshment to the common people. It cannot be a day of their refreshment, if it be made a day of mortified restraint. To be a day of worship, it must be a day of leisure from worldly business, and of abstraction from dissipated pleasure: but

longing to purchase it, nourish in their minds; and to their having higher and more pleasurable amusements than the ale-house and hard drinking." For confirmation of his statements, he refers to Howitt's *Domestic Life in Germany*, and *German Experiences*; and to Murray's *Hand-Book of Germany*. Some additional trustworthy information has lately been published by Mr William Duthie, a working jeweller in London, who, when a journeyman, plied his trade in various parts of Germany. His book is entitled *A Tramp's Wallet, stored by an English Goldsmith during his Wanderings in Germany and France*; London, Darton & Co., 1858. See particularly chapters 27 and 28, entitled, "Some German Sundays," and "More Sundays abroad." Much evidence of the modes of spending Sunday at home and in foreign countries, and the fruits thereof, are collected by Mr Alexander Marjoribanks, in his tract entitled *Mistaken Views regarding the Observance of the Sabbath*, 7th ed.; London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1840.

it need not be a dismal one." (*Sermon* xxiii.)* In the same spirit that genial and thoughtful layman Arthur Helps, in speaking of the scenes which he, like Mr Kay, had witnessed in Germany, rejoices that "in those fortunate regions they have not made a ghastly idol of the Sunday." (*Companions of my Solitude*, p. 127.) In 1854 the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Houses resolved, "That it is expedient that places of rational recreation and instruction, now closed, should be open to the public on Sunday after the hour of two o'clock p.m.; and that, so far as any such places are now closed by operation of law [see above, p. 234], such law should be so far amended as to enable the Lord Chamberlain, or other competent authority, to determine what places shall be permitted to be so opened, and for what length of time." (*Report*, p. xxvii.) They say—"Your committee cannot but remark upon the impolicy of suffering the continuance of a law which is preventive only to those who will not stoop to devices for its evasion, and who, from the excellence of their objects and the superiority of their position, should, of all others, be exempt from such restrictions. The system that suffers the singing saloons of Manchester, and Liverpool, and Cremorne, and the Eagle Tavern Gardens, to be open on the Sunday, and shuts in the face of all but the proprietors and those who may have free admission the gardens of the Zoological Society, and the vast and varied schools of 'ocular instruction' provided within the grounds and buildings of the Crystal Palace, is scarcely consistent. But there are other places of public instruction, the complete closing of which throughout the Sunday seems to your committee still less excusable. The National Gallery, the British and Geological Museums, the exhibitions at Marlborough and Gore House, and other places of public instruction, are paid for by the nation; and it does not seem to your committee reasonable that these places should be closed upon the only day that it is possible for the majority of the population to visit them without serious loss."† Lastly, there has actively existed for several years in the metropolis, an association called "The National Sunday League," whose object it is "to obtain the opening of the public museums, galleries, libraries, and gardens on Sunday, in London, and in the towns of England, Ireland, and Scotland, for the instruction, recreation, and innocent amusement of the working-classes." By the publication of tracts and a monthly *Record*, but still more by promoting public lectures and discussions,

* See the like opinions of other eminent divines in the places referred to above, i. 241.—It is hardly necessary to observe, that if the Lord's Day be *not* the Sabbath, the question as to the lawfulness or propriety of recreation on the Lord's Day is not involved, except perhaps analogically, in the question as to what was lawful on the Sabbath.

† The committee consisted of—Mr William Brown, the Judge Advocate, Sir George Goodman, Sir George Grey, the Earl of March, Sir John Pakington, Mr Beckett, Mr Barrow, Mr Gregson, Lord Dudley Stuart, Lord Ernest Bruce, Mr Packe, Mr Sotheron, Mr Lowe, and Mr Ker Seymer.

they have educed strong expressions of opinion on their side from many men eminent in science, literature, and art, as well as from the public at large, and have converted not a few to the opinion that the Puritans fell into some mistakes in regard to the proper mode of observing the Lord's Day. If this agitation be for really wholesome objects, public opinion will doubtless in due time become ripe enough to admit of a safe alteration of some of our national customs. Probably certain of the more lively kinds of recreation which find favour on the Continent will never become naturalized among the grave and earnest Britons; but if excitement and enjoyment are here, as elsewhere, among the necessities of human nature, it appears but the dictate of wisdom to endeavour, not to suppress our natural desires, but to guide them into proper channels, to moderate them when too violent, to stimulate them when sluggish, and to educe from them as much of good, alloyed with as little of evil, as human imperfection will admit of in this sublunary scene. "Recreations," says the pious Wilberforce himself, "are intended to refresh our exhausted bodily or mental powers, and to restore us with renewed vigour to the more serious occupations of life" (*Practical View of Christianity*, chap. vii.); and when truly fitted to accomplish this purpose, they naturally conduce to the moral elevation of the people. As Jeremy Taylor eloquently says, "It is certain that all that which can innocently make a man cheerful, does also make him charitable: for grief, and age, and sickness, and weariness, these are peevish and troublesome; but mirth and cheerfulness are content, and civil, and compliant, and communicative, and love to do good, and swell up to felicity only upon the wings of charity. Upon this account, here is pleasure enough for a Christian at present; and if a facete discourse, and an amicable friendly mirth, can refresh the spirit, and take it off from the vile temptation of peevish, despairing, uncomplying melancholy, it must needs be innocent and commendable." (Sermon xxiii.; Heber's edition of his *Works*, v. 348.)

The whole philosophy of the subject is well summed up by Dr Channing in his *Address on Temperance*: "To some, perhaps to many," says he, "religion and amusement seem mutually hostile, and he who pleads for the one may fall under suspicion of unfaithfulness to the other. But to fight against our nature is not to serve the cause of piety or sound morals. God, who gave us our nature, who has constituted body and mind incapable of continued effort, who has implanted a strong desire for recreation after labour, who has made us for smiles much more than for tears, who has made laughter the most contagious of all sounds, whose Son hallowed a marriage feast by his presence and sympathy, who has sent the child, fresh from his creating hand, to develop its nature by active sports, and who has endowed both young and old with a keen susceptibility of enjoyment from wit and humour,—He, who has thus formed us, cannot have intended us for a dull, monotonous life, and cannot frown on pleasures which solace our fatigue and refresh our spirits for coming toils. It is not only

possible to reconcile amusement with duty, but to make it the means of more animated exertions, more faithful attachments, more grateful piety. True religion is at once authoritative and benign. It calls us to suffer, to die, rather than to swerve a hair's breadth from what God enjoins as right and good; but it teaches us that it is right and good, in ordinary circumstances, to unite relaxation with toil, to accept God's gifts with cheerfulness, and to lighten the heart, in the intervals of exertion, by social pleasures. A religion giving dark views of God, and infusing superstitious fears of innocent enjoyment, instead of aiding sober habits, will, by making men abject and sad, impair their moral force, and prepare them for intemperance as a refuge from depression or despair." (*Works*, p. 374; Belfast edition.)

It is interesting to observe how generally the most agreeable kinds of recreation are at the same time the most attainable, and, when wisely indulged in, the most improving. A taste for natural history, for philosophy, literature, eloquence, society and conversation, for music, or the beauties of nature and art, is not only an inexhaustible source of delight to its possessor, but tends to elevate him above grovelling pursuits, to warm his piety, enlarge his sympathies, increase his knowledge, invigorate his understanding, improve his health and temper, refine his manners, and render him a more efficient worker in whatsoever sphere of usefulness he is called upon to labour with his hands or his brain.*

311. PRIESTLEY, JOSEPH, LL.D., F.R.S., *an eminent Unitarian Divine and Natural Philosopher* (*born* 1733; *died* 1804).—Letters to a Young Man, occasioned by Mr Wakefield's Essay on Public Worship: To which is added, a Reply to Mr Evanson's Objections to the Observance of the Lord's Day. Lond. 1792. 8vo. Pp. 60.

This work has already been noticed above, pp. 291, 295, 305. The Letters are entitled as follows:—1. Of the Natural Propriety of Social Prayer; 2. Of the Jewish Worship; 3. Objections to Social Prayer from the Sayings of Christ; 4. Of the Practice of the

* Readers who desire to pursue this subject are referred to the quotations and references in *Sabbath Laws*, pp. 420–449, 554–558; also to an excellent Sermon by Jeremiah Seed on Diversions, in his *Discourses*, vol. i. p. 197 (Lond. 1745), reprinted in Knox's *Family Lectures*, p. 388; Holden on *The Christian Sabbath*, pp. 115, 379, 389, 394; Remarks on Mirth, by Julius and Augustus Hare, in their *Guesses at Truth*, quoted in Knight's *Half-Hours with the Best Authors*, iii. 230; Rev. W. G. Barrett on National and Rational Recreations, in the *Manchester Papers*, No. 2, Lond. 1853; *Chambers's Journal*, 28th April 1855; Miss Sedgwick's *Home*, chap. vi.; Dr (now Sir) John Forbes's *Memorandums made in Ireland*, i. 67, 194; ii. 276–280 (Lond. 1853); and a work published some years ago by Dr Bellows of New York, on the *Relation of Public Amusements to Public Morality*.

Apostles; 5. Of the Expediency and Use of Public Worship; 6. Of Ostentation in Religion.—The Reply to Mr Evanson's Objections is mostly a reprint of Priestley's last Letter on the Lord's Day in his *Theological Repository*, vi. 465, which will be found also in Evanson's volume, p. 100. (See above, p. 291.) The Doctor now adds to it (p. 50), Remarks on Mr Evanson's Letter, which forms the concluding article in the volume just mentioned. A passage from these Remarks has already been quoted above (p. 305), and another may now be given:—

"I agree entirely," says he, "with Mr Evanson, that civil governors ought not to interfere in this business, which, as it relates to *religion*, is out of their proper province. Let no man be compelled to observe the Lord's Day in any manner that he does not himself choose; but let every man be left at perfect liberty to work or rest as he pleases; and in my opinion harvest work ought not to be neglected on that day in so uncertain a climate as ours. Were I a minister in a country place, where the chief dependence of my congregation should be upon farming, I would choose to have public worship early in the morning and late in the evening, and exhort my hearers to make the most of the middle part of the day in taking care of their hay and their corn. But I would not give up the idea of the *sanctity* of that day, in some proper sense of the word, or the appropriation of a considerable part of it to the purposes of public instruction and public worship." (Pp. 57–58.)

His reply to Wakefield goes rapidly over the ground traversed by Mrs Barbauld and Mr Parry. (Nos. 308, 309.) Here is a portion of what he says on the expediency of social prayer:—

"If an attention be paid to the real principles of human nature, which Mr Wakefield calls *the character of the human mind*, it appears to me that we must perceive the wisdom of all the usual means of virtue, and of social prayer among the rest, as what every man, be his attainments what they will, really needs, and may usefully avail himself of. Every passion or affection of our minds is strengthened by proper exercise; and all the social passions (and those of devotion are all of this class) are best exercised in company. Will any person pretend that he can be so cheerful alone as in the company of those who are as much exhilarated as himself? Does not every man feel the glow of patriotism with double fervour when others join him in expressing the same patriotic sentiments? Is not this the principle on which all clubs, and social meetings of that kind, are formed? Must not, then, the sentiments of devotion be felt with peculiar fervour when others join us in them, either in hymns or in prayer? Let any man go into a Catholic church abroad, where he will see, as I have done, the natural expressions of devotion, unrestrained by shame, and where there is no suspicion of hypocrisy, and say whether he be not excited to devotion by the sight. If he do not choose to go into a church, he may be some judge in this case by seeing even the counterfeit devotion of an actor on the stage, or viewing it in a good picture.

"Certainly there are seasons in which it is best for a man to be alone, and to pour out his heart before his Father, who seeth in secret; but at other times, especially when the mind is less disposed to fervour, it is equally advantageous to join in the common forms of adoration, confession, thanksgiving, and petition, with others. We also feel the sentiments of *brotherly love* with peculiar warmth when we present ourselves at the same time in the presence of our common Father, and jointly express the feelings that belong to our common and most interesting relation to him. This practice must, in a more especial manner, tend to repress all resentment, and promote compassion and good-will. We are all the offending children of the same parent, and equally stand in need of the same indulgence and mercy: let us therefore join in supplicating it together.

"I do not say that our present forms of devotion will suit a man in the more advanced state of being to which he will be raised in the state after death, because I know nothing of that state; but they appear to be well adapted to human nature in its present state; and we shall consult our improvement infinitely better by conforming to them than by attempting to get above them, and disregarding them. Besides, the bulk of mankind will never be in that high class of Christians which does not stand in need of the usual modes of improvement; and, in whatever rank our vanity may lead us to place ourselves, we should consider how our example may affect them." (Pp. 18–20.)

312. WILSON, JAMES, M.A.—A Defence of Public or Social Worship; in a Letter addressed to Gilbert Wakefield, B.A. Stockport, 1792. 8vo. Pp. 34.

Upon the authority of Dr Prideaux, Dean of Norwich, in his *Connection of the History of the Old and New Testament*, Part I., Mr Wilson affirms that public and social worship constituted a part of the Jewish service in the synagogue. He also observes that "our Lord seems to have been well acquainted with the prayers of the synagogue, for it is said that the form which he recommended to his disciples was chiefly compiled from them." (P. 18.) In proof of this he quotes Whitby's commentary on Matt. vi. 9 (where fragments of the Jewish liturgies are collected), to show that the whole of the Lord's Prayer is to be found in them, except only the words, "as we forgive those who have transgressed against us." Moreover, "We are told that Christ taught, and that he preached, in the synagogues; but it must be acknowledged that the Scriptures do not inform us, in positive terms, that he prayed in them. But let it be remembered that the whole is often meant to be expressed by one of its parts; therefore, if we find that public prayers were offered up in the synagogues, we shall have reason to conclude that Jesus Christ joined in that social worship." (P. 9)

In his *General Reply* (No. 315), p. 17, Mr Wakefield says that

what Mr Wilson has advanced on the subject of Jewish worship appears to him "as pertinent and sensible, to say the least, as anything that has occurred during this controversy; as also his reasonings thereupon with regard to the practice of our Lord." Mr Wakefield admits that what he spoke doubtfully and with much diffidence in the *Enquiry*, as to the non-existence of the practice of public worship in synagogues (see above, p. 276), was a mistake, which "is indubitably ascertained by this gentleman."

313. POPE, JOHN, *Tutor in the Belles Lettres and Classical Literature in the New College, Hackney.*—Divine Worship founded in Nature and supported by Scriptural Authority; An Essay. With Remarks on Mr Wakefield's Arguments against Public Worship, and Strictures on some parts of his Silva Critica, and English Version of the New Testament. Lond. 1792. 8vo. Pp. 199.

This contains six chapters on the following subjects:—1. Introductory observations on the importance of religious worship. 2. Arguments for religious worship, both private and public, from reason. 3. On public worship, as it appears in the Old Testament. 4. On public worship, as it appears in the New Testament. 5. Examination of Mr Wakefield's arguments against it. 6. Examination of some parts of the *Silva Critica*, &c.

Mr Pope argues that Christ and his apostles set an example of the practice of public worship, which example all Christians are bound to follow; because the institution "is capable of being engaged in beyond the limits of Judea, and may, without hurt, take place equally in any country. . : . It cannot," says he, "be rejected without disavowing, at the same time, the grand principle of all Christianity, namely, the indispensable obligation under which Christians are laid to set before them these great examples, and form their conduct in a corresponding manner." And if the institution "has suffered corruptions and abuses in a course of time, it is the duty of Christians, not to abolish it, but to bring it back, as far as possible, to its primitive purity." (P. 87.)

The principle here so broadly stated, in regard to the duty of following the example of Christ and his apostles, is certainly one which cannot be acted on without limitation. Not only must due weight be given to the fact that they were Jews subject to the law of Moses and conforming to the national customs, but there are other reasons why, as Jeremy Taylor says, "actions apostolical are not always rules for ever: it might be fit for them to do it *pro loco et tempore*, but yet no engagement passed thence upon following ages; for it might be convenient at that time, in the new spring of Christianity, and till they had engaged a considerable party, by that means to make them parties against the Gentiles' superstition,"

&c. (*Liberty of Prophesying*, sect. xviii. § 23.) By every Christian, in all times and places, the conduct of Jesus and his apostles must be regarded as highly *instructive*; but how far any particular acts ought to be *imitated*, except as to the spirit which they evince, is a question to be decided by considering to what extent such conduct would promote, in present circumstances, the welfare of the community. (See above, p. 35; also John Knox's *Works*, iv. 99, and Dr Priestley in Evanson's volume, No. 310, p. 48.)

314. WAKEFIELD, GILBERT (*see* No. 307).—Short Strictures on the Rev. Dr Priestley's Letters to a Young Man, concerning Mr Wakefield's Treatise on Public Worship. Lond. 1792. 8vo. Pp. 23.

An unworthy ebullition of petulance, of no value in relation to the subject of the controversy.

315. BRUCKNER, I., *a French preacher at Norwich* (*born* 1726; *died* 1804).—Thoughts on Public Worship, Part I.; containing a full Review of Mr Wakefield's Objections to this practice, with suitable Answers. Lond. 1792. 8vo. Pp. 66.

From the conservative disposition of the Jews, taken notice of by Josephus (*Contra Apion.* lib. ii. c. 20), Mr Bruckner infers that the public worship mentioned in Neh. viii. 5, 6; ix. 3, &c., and which, he says, was "established" by Ezra, continued to be practised in the time of Christ; and in this conclusion, he thinks, we shall be confirmed, if we consider that the same worship "still obtains among the modern Jews, both with regard to mode and substance; and that the service of the primitive Christians, manifestly borrowed from the Jewish Synagogue, as has been proved by the learned, consisted chiefly in the reading of Scripture and the utterance of prayer." (P. 9.) He proceeds:—

"That social worship was, as it still is, practised among the Jews at the beginning of the Christian era, is evident: (1.) From their synagogues having been from time immemorial under the direction of an inspector or minister, whom they called the chazan, whose office is thus described by their own writers: 'The chazan,* an inspector of the congregation, appointed to take the lead in public prayers.'† (2.) From the use of liturgies among them, both for the service of the synagogue and temple, which liturgies being re-

* "Chazan inspector congregationis ille est qui ecclesiæ præit in præcibus publicis."—Elias Levita ex Baal Aruch. Apud Vitringam in Archisynagogo.

† Buxtorf, on the word *Chazan*, says accordingly: "Nuncius ecclesiæ qui destinatus erat synagogæ necessariis operis præstandis. Hic maxime oratione seu præcibus et cantu ecclesiæ præibat."—*Diction. Rab. Talm.*

peated by the chazan in the synagogue, and the priest in the temple, the people answered to the prayers contained in the former, by the usual acclamation, Amen; and to those in the latter by certain doxologies.* (3.) From the ideas of superior excellence and efficacy which they attached to prayers uttered in concert with a whole congregation. God, says one of their writers, 'does not reject the prayers of the congregation, though sinners should make part of it; it behoves a man, therefore, to join in its prayers, that he may not pray alone, while he has an opportunity of praying with the congregation.'†

"That the Jewish prayers in the synagogue consisted of something more than mere blessings, as surmised by Mr W., is probable from Paul's instructions to Timothy ‡ respecting public prayers, which he divides into supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings; for it can hardly be supposed that the Jewish synagogue, which, in every other respect, except the doctrine, was the archetype of the Christian synagogue, as the Christian place of worship is called by one of the apostles,§ should not have had something similar in the division of its prayers. We find accordingly, that it divided them into blessings, supplications, and petitions; ‖ the first comprehending doxologies, or blessings, properly so called; the second, prayers for the remission of sins; the third, supplications for various blessings, more particularly for the preservation and proper use of such as are dispensed daily by the bountiful hand of Providence."¶ (Pp. 10–12.)

"Before we draw any inference from the circumstance of Christ not having prayed to the multitude either in the temple or the synagogue, we should be certain that among the Jews of old, as among Fox's and Menno's disciples in our days, this office was left entirely at the discretion of any one who chose to take it up. But who, except a slave to prejudice, will venture upon such an assertion? What! a private man, the son of a carpenter (for Christ was no more in the eyes of the Jewish hierarchy), enter the temple, enter the synagogue at any time, move boldly towards the altar or ark, take the place of the priest or the chazan, and, without any further ceremony, officiate in his stead, whether he was required to do so or not? . . Each synagogue had its ministers, each minister had his separate place and office; every part of the service was conducted with regularity, according to fixed and immutable laws, with which Christ could not interfere, without subjecting himself to suspicions and penalties, which, if we

* See Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*, in Matt. vi. 9.

† "Orationes congregationis non respuit Deus, etiamsi mixti illic adsint peccatores. Necesse est ergo ut homo se congregationi associet, ne solus oret, cum datur opportunitas orandi cum congregatione.—*Thephil.* cap. 8. Apud Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*

‡ 1 Tim. ii. 1. § James ii. 2.

‖ See Ikenii *Antiquit. Hebraicæ*, part i. chap. ii., and Buxtorf. *Diction. Rab. Talm.* in voce *Selichouth.*

¶ Josephus, *Contra Apion.* lib. ii. cap. 23.

judge from the whole tenor of his conduct, he wished above all things to avoid." * (Pp. 23–25.)

After the account above given (p. 286) of Mr Parry's reply to Wakefield, it is needless to quote any of Mr Bruckner's remarks on the New Testament passages which bear upon the point at issue.

316. WAKEFIELD, GILBERT (*see* No. 307).—A General Reply to the Arguments against the Enquiry into Public Worship. Lond. 1792. 8vo. Pp. 37.

After recapitulating his opinions, Mr Wakefield here pronounces judgment in his usual arrogant style, and almost without discussion, on the hostile publications of Dr Disney, "Eusebia," Mr Wilson (No. 312), Mrs Barbauld (No. 308), Dr Priestley (No. 311), Mr Simpson, Mr Bruckner (No. 315), and Mr Pope (No. 313). Some of these writers, however, he treats not only with respect, but even with commendation; while of Mr Pope he speaks with boundless contempt and abhorrence. Mr Parry's pamphlet (No. 309) does not appear to have come to his knowledge.

The feebleness of the sentiments of reverence and admiration in Mr Wakefield's mind is evident throughout the controversy, but most clearly in his observations on the pamphlet of Mrs Barbauld. "I should conjecture," says he, "that a particular expression in p. 17 of my *Enquiry*—'the devotional taste, forsooth!'—drew upon me the animadversions of this lady. Her present performance also seems to be overrun with a train of ideas, which, to my apprehension, has no foundation either in Scripture or philosophy; ideas that savour of all that is visionary, fanatical, and superstitious; ideas which may suit a description of Christians whose satisfactions I would not wish to impair, but find no echo in my bosom; ideas that drave mankind into cells and deserts," &c.; . . . "conceits of habitual devotion which are, to my apprehension at least, romantic and mysterious; intoxicating vapours from the chasm of puritanical fanaticism." (Pp. 19, 26.) Evidently he had no conception of the warm piety of a Taylor, a Baxter, a Boyle, a Leighton, or a Fenelon; nor was he aware of the possibility of being filled with a profoundly devotional spirit without lapsing into superstition.

A prevailing error on the opposite side, is that of assuming that all men may and ought to have these strong religious emotions, and ought to make numerous and elaborate manifestations of them, even when they are little felt. On this subject enough has already been said above, pp. 25, 33, 76, 147–152.

317. Decree of the National Convention of France, appointing a new Calendar to be used; 3 Brumaire, An 2 (24th Oct. 1793).

* See *Reasonableness of Christianity*, by Locke, vol. ii. of his Works.

By this a new era, beginning on 22d September 1792, was established in France; the divisions of the year, and names of the months and days, were altered; and for the Week was substituted the *Decade*, or period of ten days, of which the tenth was appointed to be kept as a day of rest, in place of the former Sunday. The details of this grotesque calendar may be seen in Duvergier's *Collection Complète des Lois*, &c., vol. vi. pp. 253–54 (Paris, 1834), or in Pérennès' *Institution du Dimanche*, p. 368 (Paris, 1845). It continued but twelve years in use, the Gregorian calendar having been restored by a decree of Napoleon in July 1805.

In regard to the Decade, Southey, in his *Omniana*, vol. i. pp. 161–64 (Lond. 1812), observes:—

"We have nothing to say in defence of the French revolutionists, as far as they are personally concerned in this substitution of every tenth for the seventh day as a day of rest. It was not only a senseless outrage on an ancient observance, around which a thousand good and gentle feelings had clustered; it not only tended to weaken the bond of brotherhood between France and the other members of Christendom; but it was dishonest, and robbed the labourer of fifteen days of restorative and humanising repose in every year, and extended the wrong to all the friends and fellow-labourers of man in the brute creation. Yet when we hear Protestants, and even those of the Lutheran persuasion, and members of the Church of England, inveigh against this change, as a blasphemous contempt of the Fourth Commandment, we pause; and before we can assent to the verdict of condemnation, we must prepare our minds to include in the same sentence, at least as far as theory goes, the names of several among the most revered reformers of Christianity. Without referring to Luther, we will begin with Master Frith, a founder and martyr of the Church of England, having witnessed his faith amid the flames in the year 1533 [see above, i. 186]. This meek and enlightened, no less than zealous and orthodox divine, in his *Declaration of Baptism*, thus expresses himself: 'Our forefathers which were in the beginning of the Church did abrogate the Sabbath, to the intent that men might have an example of Christian liberty. . . . Howbeit, because it was necessary that *a day* should be reserved in which the people should come together to hear the word of God, they ordained instead of the *Sabbath*, which was Saturday, the next following, which is Sunday. And although they might have kept the Saturday with the Jew, as a thing indifferent, yet they did much better.' Some three years after the martyrdom of Frith, *i.e.* anno 1536, being the 28th of Henry VIII., suffered Master Tindal in the same glorious cause [see above, i. 136]; and he likewise, in his *Answer to Sir T. More*, hath similarly resolved this point: 'As for the Sabbath (writes this illustrious martyr, and translator of The Word of Life)—As for the Sabbath, we be lords of the Sabbath, and may yet change it into Monday, or any other day, as we see need; or we may make every TENTH DAY

holy day only, if we see cause why. Neither was there any cause to change it from the Saturday, save only to put a difference between us and the Jews; neither need we any holy day at all, if the people might be taught without it.' This great man believed, that if Christian nations should ever become Christians indeed, there would every day be so many hours taken from the labour for the perishable body, to the service of the soul and the understandings of mankind, both masters and servants, as to supersede the necessity of a particular day. At present, our Sunday may be considered as so much Holy Land, rescued from the sea of oppression and vain luxury, and embanked against the fury of its billows."

The abolition of the Lord's-day and of Christian worship by the French Republicans excited, of course, a powerful reaction in Britain, not only among pious Christians, but also among conservative politicians, and the nation at large. The bishops in England, and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, issued charges and addresses on the duty of Sabbath-observance; sermons enforcing it were more frequently heard from the pulpit than before; the churches were better filled; and more serious attention was paid in families to the religious instruction of youth. In these circumstances, the "Evangelical" party, holding the views of the Puritans respecting the Sabbath, and of which Wilberforce and Hannah More were then distinguished ornaments, gained influence rapidly, and the seeds were sown which have since produced so abundant a crop of zeal for the strict observance of the Lord's-day. (See Bishop Wilson's preface to his edition of Wilberforce's *Practical Christianity;* the Rev. William Jay's *Autobiography*, Letter 18; the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xcviii. pp. 274, 275; and *Sabbath Laws*, pp. 335-340, 277.)

In 1794, 1795, and 1799, attempts were ineffectually made in Parliament to render Sabbath-breaking punishable by imprisonment, and to suppress Sunday newspapers. (*Parl. Hist.* xxx. 1464; xxxi. 1428; xxxiv. 1006–1014.)

318. PORTEUS, BEILBY, D.D., *Bishop of London* (*see* No. 297). A Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of London, on the Profanation of the Lord's-day. Lond. 1797. (In his Works, vi. 288–292.)

The profanations against which this Letter is directed are "the travelling of stage-waggons and stage-coaches on the Lord's-day, the printing and dispersing of Sunday newspapers, the exercise of several worldly trades and occupations (among which some public breweries have, I am told, been noticed), and more particularly the practice which has within these last two or three years very much prevailed, of employing various labourers and workmen, such as carpenters, bricklayers, painters, &c., in repair-

ing and erecting houses and other buildings on Sundays, as on the common days of the week."

The Bishop tells his clergy—"I have myself found by experience in more cases than one, that a friendly representation of the extreme impropriety and mischief of such practices made privately to the authors of them will sometimes have the desired effect. If, however, this should fail, you will then naturally have recourse in the first place to your churchwardens for their co-operation and assistance; and their exertions in the zealous execution of their office have, I know, been frequently attended with success. But if still higher authority be found necessary, application must be made to the magistrates of the district in which your parish is situated, for their concurrence and support."

A few years later, namely in 1805, Bishop Porteus assailed the custom, then gaining ground in the fashionable world, of Sunday concerts by professional performers in private houses, where large numbers assembled, and the stillness of the evening was disturbed. With this purpose he separately addressed a letter of expostulation to three ladies of high rank, who, by opening their houses for such musical entertainments, had become the leaders of the fashion objected to. He wished, however, not to be misunderstood: "I am no friend," he added, "to a pharisaical or puritanical observance of the Lord's-day. I do not contend that it should be either to the poor or to the rich, or to any other human being whatever, a day of gloom and melancholy, a day of superstitious rigour, a day of absolute exclusion from all society. No, it is on the contrary a festival, a joyful festival, to which we ought always to look forward with delight, and enjoy with a thankful and a grateful heart. It is only to those amusements which partake of the nature and complexion of *public diversions* on the Lord's-day, that I object; to large assemblies, for instance, and large concerts consisting of hired performers, where numerous parties are collected together, occasioning a great concourse of servants in one place, employing them at a time when they have a right to ease and rest, and producing much of that noise and tumult in the public streets, which are so opposite to the peaceful tranquillity that should prevail on that day—a day which the Almighty himself has distinguished with a peculiar mark of sanctity, and which he claims *as his own*. It is against these open infractions of the Lord's-day that I think it my duty to remonstrate. But in hearing sacred music on the Sunday evening, confined to a small domestic circle of relations and friends, without any hired performers, I am so far from seeing any impropriety, that it appears to me a relaxation well suited to the nature of a Christian Sabbath, perfectly congenial to the spirit of our religion, and calculated to raise our minds to heavenly thoughts, and sublime and holy contemplations." (Life by Hodgson, prefixed to Porteus's *Works*, pp. 195–97.)

In the same volume, pp. 138, 249, some other exertions of the Bishop to promote the observance of the Lord's-day are recorded.

319. PALMER, SAMUEL.—An Apology for the Christian Sabbath. Lond. 1799.

While contending earnestly for the duty of Sabbath-observance, Mr Palmer recommends that children be in this respect mercifully dealt with. "I would here," says he, "enter a serious caution to all the pious heads of families against making the services of the Sabbath unnecessarily burdensome to any under their roof, especially to children, who have too often imbibed an unhappy prejudice against religion through the excessive rigour of pious parents and masters, who have not made sufficient allowance for the vivacity of youth. It is unwise and injurious to keep their minds perpetually on the stretch, by forcing them to spend every moment of the Sabbath in hearing, reading, and prayer. Christ's 'yoke is easy, and his burden light;' and they do him and their families a great injury who make it heavy. As religion is a reasonable service, so it is a pleasant one, and nothing should be done or said to represent it otherwise. Very long services are what few can bear, and what none are better for; especially young persons and children. 'Short and sweet' is a maxim which applies to nothing better than to religious duties; between which there ought to be proper intervals, to unbend, and thus to strengthen the mind, as well as to refresh the body." (P. 67.)*

320. HORSLEY, SAMUEL, LL.D., F.R.S., *Bishop of St Asaph* (*born* 1733; *died* 1806).—Three Sermons on the Sabbath; in vol. ii. of his Sermons, Dundee, 1810.

Bishop Horsley's Sermons have been several times reprinted in one volume, and the three which relate to the Sabbath (being the 21st, 22d, and 23d) have been published separately by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, in their tract No. 913, Lond. 1863. These three are also to be found in the collection of *Family Lectures* edited by Dr Vicesimus Knox, Lond. 1815, pp. 292–310.

His doctrine is, that the Fourth Commandment was a Jewish law which has been abrogated with the rest of the Mosaic code; but that, the Sabbath having been instituted at the creation, we are bound by the primeval law to set apart one day in seven—not however the seventh day of the week, but the first, in memory of our Lord's resurrection. As to the alteration of the day, he says modestly, that it "*seems* to have been made by the authority of

* The picture which Dr Chalmers gives of the misery of children placed under a Sunday regime of "strict, unbending austerity," is evidently drawn from his own experience and observation. See Discourse on the Christianity of the Sabbath, in his *Congregational Sermons*, ii. 274. The passage is quoted in Dr Hessey's Bampton Lectures on *Sunday*, p. 471. See also the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xcviii. p. 289.

the apostles;" but he afterwards without hesitation asserts, on the usual grounds, that from the time of Christ's second appearance to the disciples after his resurrection, "the Sunday was the constant Sabbath of the primitive Church." (Serm. xxiii.) As to the manner of spending it, we have already seen (above, p. 312) how widely he differed from the Puritans.

In Sermon xxi. he illustrates with great ability the difference between moral and positive laws, and shows from Mark ii. 27 that the law of the Sabbath, being positive, gave way to higher laws when in conflict with them. Sermon xxii. is devoted to the question, "What regard is due to the institution of a Sabbath under the Christian dispensation?" which he answers by saying —"Neither more nor less than was due to it in the patriarchal ages, before the Mosaic covenant took place." With respect to the objection founded on the fact that there is no mention of Sabbath-observance in the apostolic decree recorded in Acts xv. 28, 29, he confesses that had the Sabbath been a rite of the Mosaic institution, or were any reason to be assigned for the prohibition of the eating of blood, which might be of equal force in all ages, he should feel himself compelled to admit that the disregard of the Sabbath by Gentile Christians were a less crime than the use of blood, which *was* prohibited to them. "But although," he adds, "the Sabbath was gone into disuse among the heathen long before the appearance of our Saviour, yet the most ignorant idolater observed some stated festivals in honour of the imaginary divinities to which his worship was addressed. When an idolater, therefore, was converted, the natural consequence of his conversion—that is, of his going over from the worship of idols to the worship of the true God,—*the natural and immediate consequence would be, that he would observe the festival of the true God instead of the festival of his idol.* Thus the Gentile convert would spontaneously adopt the observation of the Sabbath, as a natural duty—a branch, indeed, of that most general commandment, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God.' It was therefore as little necessary that the Sabbath should be expressly [directed to be] observed in the apostolical decree, as that express reservation should be made of any other of the ten commandments: nor is the neglect of the Sabbath more to be justified by the silence of the apostolical council concerning the necessity of the observation, than idolatry or blasphemy is to be justified by their silence about the second or third commandment."

This ingenious theory is based on the assumption that the Lord's-day was regarded by the Gentile converts in apostolic times as the Sabbath, with a change of the day. But even if that assumption were admissible, the theory would labour under the disadvantage of being absolutely destitute of historical proof, and at the same time opposed to every indication afforded by the apostolic epistles. So far as is known, the Sabbath was regarded by Jew and Gentile alike as an institution exclusively Mosaic; and there is no reason to believe that any of the Gentile Christians

were led, by studying the Jewish Scriptures, to discover a primeval Sabbath-law, universally and permanently binding. That those of the second century repudiated wholly and absolutely the observance of the Sabbath, is certain from their writings; and that their earliest predecessors did so too, appears plainly from the disputes to which Paul refers in Rom. xiv. 5, 6, Gal. iv. 10, 11, and Col. ii. 13–17. On these passages, indeed, the opponents of Sabbatarianism have founded their main objection to Horsley's theory: they urge that Paul,—in declaring that Christians (those of Gentile blood, at least) were nowise bound to esteem one day above another, and ought not to observe days, and could not justly be condemned by others in respect of the Sabbaths,—would certainly, if there *was* a universal and permanent Sabbath-law, have added a warning to the Gentile converts, that he was speaking merely of the Jewish Sabbaths, and that, though not bound to observe these, they were under an obligation, long lost sight of by heathen nations, but which still subsisted in its primeval force, to observe a Sabbath instituted at the creation of the world. (See above, pp. 31, 259.)

In Sermon xxiii. the Bishop adverts to the different modes of expounding the first chapter of Genesis, and decides for its literal interpretation:—"The testimony of the sacred historian is peremptory and explicit. No expressions could be found in any language to describe a gradual progress of the work for six successive days, and the completion of it on the sixth, in the literal and common sense of the word 'day,' more definite and unequivocal than those employed by Moses; and they who seek or admit figurative expositions of such expressions as these, seem to be not sufficiently aware, that it is one thing to write a history, and quite another to compose riddles. The expressions in which Moses describes the days of the creation, literally rendered, are these: When he has described the first day's work, he says—'And there was morning and there was evening, one day;' when he has described the second day's work, 'There was morning and there was evening, a second day;' when he has described the third day's work, 'There was evening and there was morning, a third day.' Thus, in the progress of his narrative, at the end of each day's work, he counts up the days which had passed off from the beginning of the business; and, to obviate all doubt what portion of time he meant to denote by the appellation of 'a day,' he describes each day of which the mention occurs as consisting of one evening and one morning, or, as the Hebrew words literally import, of the decay of light and the return of it. By what description could the word 'day' be more expressly limited to its literal and common meaning, as denoting that portion of time which is measured and consumed by the earth's revolution on her axis? That this revolution was performed in the same space of time in the beginning of the world as now, I would not over-confidently affirm; but we are not at present concerned in the resolution of that question: a day, whatever was its space, was still the same thing in nature—

a portion of time measured by the same motion, divisible into the same seasons of morning and noon, evening and midnight, and making the like part of longer portions of time measured by other motions. The day was itself marked by the vicissitudes of darkness and light; and so many times repeated, it made a month, and so many times more, a year. For six such days God was making the heaven and the earth, the sea, and all that therein is; and rested on the seventh day. This fact, clearly established by the sacred writer's testimony, in the literal meaning of these plain words, abundantly evinces the perpetual importance and propriety of consecrating one day in seven to the public worship of the Creator."

SKETCH

OF THE

CHIEF CONTROVERSIES ABOUT THE SABBATH

IN

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

DURING the first quarter of the present century the Sabbath Question was but little discussed in Britain. Not only did the arduous struggle with Napoleon divert men's minds from theological controversy, but the manifold utility of a weekly day of rest was so generally admitted, and the national antipathy to the French revolutionists continued so strong, that those who doubted either the Scriptural authority of the Lord's-day, or the identity of that institution with the Sabbath, were content to leave the "Evangelical" party in possession of the field, so long as no attempt was made by its adherents to interfere with the liberty of others. Of the few treatises on the Sabbatarian side which appeared from time to time during the period referred to, the main object was to prove, in opposition to Paley, that the law of the Sabbath was given to mankind at the creation, and will bind them till the end of the world; that the Fourth Commandment is, in like manner, a universal and perpetual law; and that the Sabbath-day was changed by divine authority from the seventh to the first of the week. The following list comprises, it is believed, all the publications worth mentioning on this side of the question, from 1801 to 1829; in some of them, however (such as the first), the Mosaic element is far less conspicuous than in most:—*An Apology for the Sabbath*, by JOHN PRIOR ESTLIN (Bristol, 1801; 8vo, pp. 48).—*An Essay on the Christian Sabbath, including Remarks on Sunday Duelling*, by JOSEPH HUGHES, A.M., 2d ed. (Lond. 1804; 8vo, pp. 34).—*An Historical and Practical Discourse on the Sabbath Day*, by FRANCIS WEST, preacher of the Gospel (Chester, 1805; 12mo, pp. 104).*—*An Essay on the Christian Sabbath, being the Norrisian Prize Essay for*

* In 1805 were published in Edinburgh, JAMES GRAHAME'S admirable poems, *The Sabbath, and Sabbath Walks*, whose influence in promoting a pious and rational observance of the Lord's-day has undoubtedly been great.—WILLIAM COCKIN'S poem, *The Rural Sabbath*,

1809, by WILLIAM BOLLAND, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge (Camb. 1809; 8vo, pp. 74).—*Friendly Admonition or Serious Advice to all Sabbath-breakers, and Neglecters of God's Public Worship*, by CHARLES GARDENER, D.D., Rector of Sutton, Surrey (Lond. 1809; 8vo, pp. 63). This writer takes great liberty with the words of a verse in Leviticus, which he uses as a motto for his pamphlet, and represents as being addressed, not to the Jews in relation to their tabernacle and temple, but to us. The words in Scripture are these: "Ye shall keep my sabbaths, and reverence my sanctuary; I *am* Jehovah." But on Dr Gardener's title-page the text is amplified thus: "'Ye shall keep my sabbaths, and my sanctuary or holy place, my church or house of prayer, ye shall reverence, reverence religiously, respect, or attend, my public worship with strictness and piety; I (am) Jehovah.' *God's own words to us*, Lev. xix. 30."—*An Enquiry into the Antiquity of the Sabbath, chiefly in reference to the Opinion of Paley*, by WILLIAM COOPER, B.D., Dublin (Lond. 1814, 8vo).—*A Treatise on the Institution of the Lord's Day*, by the Hon. and Rev. HENRY LESLIE, Chaplain in Ordinary to the King (Lond. 1815; 8vo, pp. 124).—*Two Essays; one on the Effects of Christianity, the other on the Sabbath*, by the late JOHN SIMPSON (Lond. 1815; 8vo, pp. 125).—*A Treatise on the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian Sabbath*, by THOMAS WEMYSS (Edin. 1816).—*Essay on the Sanctification of the Lord's Day*, by the Rev. SAMUEL GILFILLAN, Comrie (Edin. 1817, 12mo).—*On the Institution and Obligation of the Christian Sabbath*, an article in the *Christian Observer* for June 1817, by the Rev. THOMAS SCOTT, Rector of Aston Sandford, Bucks; reprinted in his *Works*, vol. x. p. 443 (Lond. 1823), of which see also vol. i. p. 237.—*A Treatise on the Sabbath; or, Illustrations of the origin, obligation, change, proper observance, and spiritual advantages of that holy day*; by JOHN GLEN, minister of the Chapel in Portobello (Edin. 1822; 12mo, pp. 261).—*A Dissertation on the Sabbath; in which the nature of the Institution, and the Obligations to its observance, are stated and illustrated*; by JOHN MACBETH, A.M. (Glasg. 1822; 12mo, pp. 315: reprinted at Philad. 1828).—*Ingenuous Scruples relating to the Sabbath answered*, by MISS MANT (Lond. 1824, 12mo).—*The Christian Sabbath; or an Inquiry into the religious obligation of keeping holy one day in seven*; by GEORGE HOLDEN, A.M. (Lond. 1825; 8vo, pp. 515). Mr Holden was the incumbent of a parish near Liverpool. His work is justly characterised by Sir W. Domville as "a treatise conspicuous alike for its learned research, and for a degree of can-

a work of considerable though inferior merit, appeared at London in the same year, but was written in 1792. Other poems with a like tendency are, *The Poor Man's Sabbath*, by JOHN STRUTHERS of Glasgow, 3d ed., Edin. 1809; *A Sabbath among the Mountains* [by JAMES GRAY, one of the Masters of the High School of Edinburgh], 3d ed., Edin. 1825; and *The Day of Rest*, Dublin, 1830. An elegant recent volume contains extracts from Grahame, Hemans, Mant, Howitt, Rogers, Wilson, Clare, Cowper, Landon, &c.; its title is *Sabbath Bells chimed by the Poets; illustrated by* BIRKETT FOSTER; 2d ed., Lond. 1858.

dour seldom seen in theological controversy." (Domville, ii. 144; see also pp. 86, 60, 143, and 166 of the same volume, and the Supplement to his *Examination of the Six Texts*, &c.; Hessey's *Bampton Lectures on Sunday*, p. 431; and extracts from Holden in Cox, pp. 505, 506, 528, 542, 544, 554.) The titles of his chapters are: I. The political advantages of the Sabbatical Institution. II. Its perpetual obligation proved from its first appointment. III. The Sabbatical Institution under the Mosaic Dispensation: 1. Jewish Sabbath; 2. Whether the Sabbatical Institution was to survive, or to be abrogated with, Judaism. IV. The Sabbatical Institution under the Christian Dispensation: 1. So far from being abrogated, it is enjoined in the New Testament; 2. Of the day of the Christian Sabbath. V. Testimony of the Primitive Church to the Sabbatical Institution. VI. Duties of the Christian Sabbath: 1. The Christian Sabbath considered as a day of rest and relaxation; 2. Its religious observance. Conclusion.—*The Institution and Observance of the Sabbath considered* (Lond. 1826; 12mo, pp. 98).—*The Change of the Sabbath, and the Institution of the Eucharist, illustrated from the Jewish Scriptures, for obviating the inferences both of Jews and of Roman Catholics; with an Appendix, animadverting on a Tract by William Burgh, A.B.*; by GEORGE MILLER, D.D., M.R.I.A. (Lond. 1829; 8vo, pp. 56).*

On the other hand, the opinion that the Lord's-day is *not* the

* Dr Miller endeavours to prove from the Jewish Scriptures that the change of the Sabbath-day was authorised by typical indications of the Christian covenant. In reply to the argument of the Roman Catholics, that the change of day is an instance of the authoritative tradition for which they contend, he maintains that the change was authorised, "though not by an express injunction contained in the sacred writings, yet by occurrences recorded in them." (P. 9.) His main purpose, however, is to show that the alteration was required for the due accomplishment of the types, and that there were satisfactory reasons why it should not have been expressly and generally enjoined. The argument from the types, he thinks fitted to weigh also with the Jews.

The Roman Catholic argument in question is urged by Dr Lingard in his *Strictures on Dr Marsh's 'Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome,'* chap. 3. (Lingard's *Collection of Tracts on several subjects*, p. 421; Lond. 1826, 8vo.) He ridicules the argument of Marsh, that "it is evident from Acts xx. 7, and 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, that the practice of the primitive Christians to assemble, for the purpose of worship, on the first day of the week, in commemoration of Christ's resurrection, had the sanction of St Paul himself; and since this is recorded in the *Written* Word, what necessity is there for an appeal to the *Unwritten* Word?" (*Compar. View*, &c., Lond. 1814, chap. vii. p. 142.) "Now, reader," says Lingard on this, "examine these two important passages, and learn how loosely the most acute logicians are compelled to reason, when they attempt to draw the whole of their religion from the Scriptures alone. . . That '*practice*,' which is so clear to him, is perfectly invisible to me. In Acts xx. 7, mention is only made of *one* meeting; and whether that was held to commemorate Christ's resurrection, or to receive the instructions of St Paul on the eve of his departure, we are ignorant. The latter is in itself as probable as the former; and no inference can thence be drawn of the obligation of observing the Sunday." He quotes the original Greek

Sabbath, but an independent institution of the Christian Church, either authorised, as some think, by the Apostles, or, as others conceive, voluntarily observed by the early converts and their successors, in memory of the resurrection of Christ and because of the utility of the practice, was advocated in *Thoughts on the Institution of the Sabbath, and the Ancient and Modern Observance of it*, by FIDUS (Dublin, 1818; 8vo, pp. 19); also by Dr GEORGE COOK, minister of Laurencekirk, and afterwards Professor of Moral Philosophy at St Andrews, in his *General and Historical View of Christianity*, vol. ii. pp. 281–326 (Edin. 1822); passages in which are quoted by Hessey, pp. 358–59, and above, p. 161. The same view was acutely and pungently maintained by Mr GODFREY HIGGINS of Skellow Grange near Doncaster, in his *Horæ Sabbaticæ, or an Attempt to correct certain superstitious and vulgar errors respecting the Sabbath* (Lond. 1826; 12mo, pp. 86: 2d ed., with an Appendix, 1833, pp. 108: 3d edition, with additions and an autobiography, 1851: Reprinted in *The Pamphleteer*, vol. xxvii. p. 153; and quoted by Cox, *Sabbath Laws*, pp. 506, 533, 536, 541). He was answered in two pamphlets: *Remarks on the Horæ Sabbaticæ of Godfrey Higgins, Esq.*, by HENRY STANDISH, Gent. (Doncaster, 1826; 8vo, pp. 58); and *A Letter to Godfrey Higgins, Esq., on the subject of his Horæ Sabbaticæ*, by the Rev. T. S. HUGHES, B.D., Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge (Camb. 1826; 8vo, pp. 43: reprinted in *The Pamphleteer*, vol. xxvii. p. 214; replied to by Higgins in the Appendix to his second edition; and criticised by Domville, i. 31–35, 73, 80, 103, 110, 124, 331; ii. 71, 80, 106–110, 263; see also above, i. 113, 221; ii. 294). About this time, too, Sabbatarianism was opposed by Mr ISAAC DISRAELI in his *Inquiry into the Literary and Political Character of James I.*, containing chapters on "The Book of Sports" and "The Sabbatarian Controversy," and reprinted in his *Miscellanies of Literature*, p. 345 (Lond. 1840; royal 8vo). Mr Disraeli treats of the subject likewise in his *Commentaries on the Life and Reign of Charles I.*, of which a revised edition was published at London in 1851. At the beginning of vol. ii. are three chapters entitled—

words, which mean, "the disciples having been assembled to break bread;" because the authorised English version "seems to hint, rather remotely indeed, that they were *accustomed* to assemble on that day." As for the passage in 1 Cor., he considers it as still less to the purpose than the other; since "it will not be pretended that to put by weekly alms in private, and to assemble for the purpose of religious worship in public, are one and the same thing." He urges further, that as the Fourth Commandment orders the observance of the *seventh* day, and as no warrant in Scripture for disregarding this law can be produced, it must be acknowledged that the Scripture does not contain the whole doctrine of the apostles. See on the same subject Dr John Milner's *End of Religious Controversy*, Letter XI.

Burgh's tract is entitled *The Scriptural Observance of the First Day of the Week, considered with reference to the change of the Sabbath.* He denies that the New Testament affords any grounds for concluding that the Lord's-day is the Sabbath.

"Of the Sabbatical Institutions," "Observation of the Sabbath upon Sundays," and "The cause of the revival by Charles I. of the 'Book of Sports' for recreation on Sundays." On the same side is JONATHAN DYMOND, a member of the Society of Friends, in *Essays on the Principles of Morality*, published at London in 1829, the year after his death, and since reprinted several times there and in America (Essay II., chap. i., section on Sabbatical Institutions). He agrees in the main with Paley, but thinks that the only reason why the first day of the week ought to be preferred by us to the other days is, that, in imitation of the practice of the early Christians, it is *already set apart* for religious exercises: "As there is no sanctity in any day," says he, "and no obligation to appropriate one day rather than another, that which is actually fixed upon is the best and the right one. Bearing in mind, then, that it is right to devote *some* portion of our time to religious exercises, and that no objection exists to the day which is actually appropriated, the duty seems very obvious,—so to employ it." He opposes work, travelling, and amusements on Sunday, but merely because they interfere with the performance of religious duties, and not as being in themselves profane.—But the chief reviver of the controversy respecting the Sabbath and the Lord's-day was Dr RICHARD WHATELY, now Archbishop of Dublin; who, first in a Note on the Abolition of the Law, appended to his *Essays on some of the Difficulties in the Writings of St Paul* (Lond. 1828), and afterwards more fully in his *Thoughts on the Sabbath* (Lond. 1830; 8d ed., Lond. 1845, 8vo. pp. 52, to which is subjoined an Address to the Inhabitants of Dublin on the Observance of the Lord's-day), maintained that the two institutions are unconnected with each other, and that the Lord's-day was established, not by the Apostles, but by "the Church" that succeeded them and voluntarily followed their *practice*.—In *Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr*, by Dr JOHN KAYE, Bishop of Lincoln (Camb. 1829; 2d ed., Lond. 1836), the notion that the Lord's-day is the Sabbath is discountenanced, and the remark is made that the former can only to this very small extent be truly said to have been substituted for the latter—that the early Gentile Christians, who at first observed the Lord's-day in conjunction with the Sabbath, and solely with a reference to the resurrection, afterwards assigned in addition to that reason another, namely, that on the first day of the week the Creator had *begun* the work of which the Sabbath commemorated the *close*. (Pp. 94–97, 1st ed.) The Bishop's treatise was reviewed in *The British Critic*, No. 13, vol. vii. p. 152 (Lond. 1830), by a writer as much opposed as himself to the Sabbatarianism of the Puritans; and the subject is resumed in vol. viii. pp. 148, 166, 221. But in a previous number of that journal (No. 10, vol. v. p. 876, April 1829), another critic, in discussing Dr Whately's Note on the Abolition of the Law, had argued that the Law and the Prophets are still important for our *instruction*, while the Fourth Commandment,—as "found within the same hallowed inclosure which fences in cer-

tain imperishable laws of human nature,"—is in some degree permanently and universally *binding*.

Partly, no doubt, in opposition to Higgins and Whately, but mainly from an increase of zeal on the part of the Sabbatarians, there now began a series of vigorous efforts by them, which have continued with little interruption to the present time. On 3d November 1829, the secretaries of the Religious Instruction Society of London presented to a meeting of its subscribers an alarming *Statement on the awful Profanation of the Lord's-day;* and in consequence, *Respectful Addresses* from the Society to the clergy of the United Kingdom, to tradesmen and shopkeepers, and to masters and heads of families, were widely distributed through the country. In 1830, the Rev. HERBERT SMITH, curate of East Stratton, Hants, began to agitate against travelling by stage-coaches on Sunday; in furtherance of which object he published *A Sermon on the Holy Authority and binding Character of the Law of the Sabbath, with some instances of its grievous Profanation in the present day;* also *Correspondence containing some interesting particulars concerning the Lord's-day, published for the purpose of promoting well-organized Sabbath Societies throughout England* (12mo, pp. 52). In the same year was instituted the Sabbath Protection Society of London; and Dr SAMUEL LEE, Professor of Arabic at Cambridge, appended to his *Six Sermons on the Study of the Holy Scriptures* (Lond. 1830, 8vo), a Dissertation in which he treated of "The Permanency of the Moral Law, in reply to a work by the Rev. Dr Whately," and of "The Primitive, the Jewish, and the Christian Sabbath." (Dissert. I., sections 10 and 11.)* On the same side Dr C. J. BLOMFIELD, Bishop of London, lent his powerful influence, by addressing to the inhabitants of the metropolis *A Letter on the present neglect of the Lord's Day* (6th ed., Lond. 1830, pp. 38); in which, however, he somewhat disappointed the "Evangelical" party, by intimating his opinion that the Lord's-day is not the Sabbath, "though it may now with propriety be termed the Christian Sabbath." (P. 36.) "I am no advocate," he also wrote, "for a pharisaical observance of the Christian Sabbath, nor would I interfere with those quiet recreations which different individuals may think fit to allow themselves, provided that no offence be committed against public decorum, nor any shock given to that public opinion of the sanctity of the Lord's day, which is a chief security for the continuance of religion amongst us." (P. 32.) The abuses pointed to in this Letter are, traffic in food, drinking in gin-shops, resorting to tea-gardens, sailing in steam-boats on the Thames, loading and unloading canal boats, reading Sunday

* The titles of several other publications, expressly in reply to Dr Whately, by Cameron, Foster, Barter, and Stopford, will be found below. He is opposed also by Mant, Conder, Wardlaw, and a writer in the *Presbyterian Review* for January 1832; while his doctrine of church-authority is controverted by Fearon, Walker, and Fulton, who however agree with him that the Lord's-day is not the Sabbath. Whately is quoted above, p. 144, and in *Sabbath Laws*, pp. 119, 221, 504, 542.

newspapers, holding convivial and festive meetings, card-parties, and literary *conversazioni*, but above all, resorting to gaming-houses on Sunday. In consequence of it, numerous sermons inculcating the duty of observing the Lord's-day were preached throughout the diocese; and a series of such, delivered some time previously by the Rev. DANIEL WILSON, then vicar of Islington, and afterwards Bishop of Calcutta, was published under the title of *The Divine Authority and Perpetual Obligation of the Lord's Day asserted* (Lond. 1830; 3d ed., 1840, 12mo, pp. 194). The book was reprinted at Boston, U.S., in 1831, with a recommendatory preface by the Rev. L. Woods, D.D., professor in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Massachusetts. Its contents are as follows: 1. The institution of the weekly Sabbath in Paradise, and its continued authority, until the delivery of the moral law. 2. The authority and dignity of the Sabbath under the law of Moses. 3. The Sabbath vindicated, under the gospel, from pharisaical austerities, and set forth in more than its original dignity and glory. 4. The Sabbath transferred by divine authority from the seventh to the first day of the week, or Lord's-day. 5. The practical duties of the Christian Sabbath. 6. The unspeakable importance of the right observation of the Sabbath, with the evils of the opposite abuse. 7. The guilt which is contracted by Christian nations in proportion as the Lord's-day is openly profaned.—Among the other publications of the same year may be mentioned, *The Benefit and Necessity of the Christian Sacraments, and the perpetual obligation of the Moral Law, particularly as binding us to keep the Christian Sabbath, considered in four sermons, preached before the University of Oxford; with an Appendix, illustrating the last of these subjects, in remarks on Dr Heylin's History of the Sabbath;* by WILLIAM JAMES, M.A., vicar of Cobham, Surrey (Lond. 1830; 8vo, pp. 269). Contents of Sermon IV., entitled "The Lord's-day the Christian Sabbath:"—The seventh day kept holy from the creation. This, then, no transitory rite of Moses' law. Nature of the duty of keeping a Sabbath. This duty equally fulfilled by keeping the first day of the week, the change having been made by sufficient authority. Proof that the Lord's-day was so kept, from the Scriptures, from writers in the first ages of Christianity, Pliny, Ignatius, Barnabas, Justin Martyr, and Tertullian. Effect of Constantine's edict. Athanasius. Hilary. The doctrine that a perpetual Sabbath is substituted for the Jewish Sabbath, no reason why the Lord's-day is not also. Obligation to keep this day from the fourth commandment. In what degree Christians are released from the strict rest there required. Contents of Appendix to this Sermon:—Heylin's argument on the times before the Law. His argument from the N. T. The Apostolical Canons. Saturday a fast in the Western Churches, and a feast in the Eastern Churches. Heylin's argument from Justin and Tertullian. Irenæus. Clement of Alexandria. Origen. Cyprian. Athanasius. Councils of Macon and Laodicea. State of opinion before the Reformation. The

Reformed Churches on the Continent. The Church of England before Queen Mary's reign; in the reign of Elizabeth; in the reign of James and Charles I. Difference of opinion among English divines. The old and true doctrine vindicated. This doctrine held by most of the English divines. The Church Catechism. —Mr JAMES wrote also *A Proof that the Day of Pentecost in Acts ii. was the Lord's Day* (Lond. 1833; 8vo, pp. 23). It is intended to correct an argument used in his former book to show that the Holy Ghost was first given on the Lord's-day.—*The Christian Sabbath, its institution and obligation; in a Letter occasioned by some recent publications;* by RICHARD MANT, D.D., Bishop of Down and Connor (Oxford, 1830; 8vo, pp. 69). He agrees with Archbishops Sharp and Secker (above, pp. 141, 213), and his remarks are evidently aimed chiefly at Whately. The arguments for a primeval Sabbath are fully and clearly stated; the support which the original law is held to receive from the Mosaic code is next adverted to; and in regard to Christians it is held, that the Sabbath "was recognised by our blessed Lord in respect of its primeval origin, and of its moral obligation, as fit to be observed by the members of his Church; and that it was, in fact, accordingly observed by the apostles and the first Christians,—the day of the observance having been fixed either by our Lord himself, or by the apostles, acting as his delegates in the government of the Church, and with his sanction, to be 'the first day of the week,' or Sunday, or that which was by them, and has been since by the Christian Church, most appropriately called 'the Lord's-day.'" —*Brief Remarks on the History, Authority, and Use of the Sabbath,* by JOSEPH JOHN GURNEY (Norwich, 1830). There are several editions of this tract; one of which, printed in America, has a preface and notes by Moses Stuart: these notes are appended to the author's 4th ed. (Lond. 1839; 24mo, pp. 104). The work is freely criticised by Domville, in i. 64, 92, 95, 98, 104, 125, 151; and some particulars respecting it will be found in the author's *Memoirs,* edited by J. B. Braithwaite, i. 437 (Norwich, 1854). Mr Gurney treats briefly of the Sabbath in vol. ii. of the same work, p. 550.— *The Law of the Sabbath, Religious and Political,* by JOSIAH CONDER, (Lond. 1830, 8vo, pp. 64; enlarged edition, Lond. 1852). This is chiefly a reprint of two articles in the *Eclectic Review* for June and October 1830. The second edition includes also an article in the same Review for April 1832, and Prefatory Remarks reprinted from the *Patriot* newspaper.—*Three Sermons on the Lord's Day,* by JOHN FORBES, minister of the Outer High Church, Glasgow (Glasg. 1831; 18mo, pp. 118).—*Considerations on the Divine Authority of the Lord's Day, or Christian Sabbath, in Reply to Dr Whately and others,* by the Rev. C. R. CAMERON, M.A., Incumbent of St George Donningtonwood, Salop (Oxford, 1831; 8vo, pp. 88).—*Four Lectures on the Law of the Sabbath, as contained in the Scriptures,* by HENRY FORSTER BURDER, D.D. (Lond. 1831; 18mo, pp. 111).

By this agitation of the subject, public attention was extensively roused; but, the better to secure practical results, a "Society

for Promoting the Due Observance of the Lord's-day" was established in London. Mr Joseph Wilson of Clapham took the lead in this matter, and obtained the willing co-operation of the Vicar of Islington, who prepared a statement of the objects and principles of the Society, and the rules by which its proceedings were to be directed. It was formed in 1831, Mr Joseph Wilson accepting the office of its Honorary Secretary. (See *Statistics and Facts in reference to the Lord's Day*, by John T. Baylee, B.A., Clerical Secretary of the Society, p. 155.) The statement of the Society's objects is given by Mr Baylee, with a narrative of its exertions in opposition to the "desecration" of the day by trading and marketing; by work on canals, rivers, railways; in the post-office; in iron-works, bakehouses, dairies, public-houses, and the London Zoological Gardens. Of this Society one of the most zealous and indefatigable members was SIR ANDREW AGNEW, Bart., M.P. for Wigtownshire, who in 1832 procured the appointment of a Select Committee of the House of Commons to inquire into the manner in which the Lord's-day was observed in Great Britain, and to suggest such alterations of the existing laws as might seem to them expedient. Their *Report*, which was ordered on 6th August 1832 to be printed, sets forth "that the evidence which has been submitted to them exhibits a systematic and widely-spread violation of the Lord's Day, which, in their judgment, cannot fail to be highly injurious to the best interests of the people, and which is calculated to bring down upon the country the Divine displeasure." This Report, and also selections and extracts from the copious evidence appended to it, were reprinted as tracts by the Society; the evidence selected being that of "the Bishop of London and Dr Farre," of "Magistrates, superintendents of police, and parochial authorities," of "Shopkeepers and on Public Markets," on "Road-travelling and traffic on Canals," on "Steamboats," on "Prisons," of "Rev. J. E. Tyler, Rev. John W. Cunningham, and J. Twells, Esq.," and "Respecting Scotland." The Report was reprinted likewise at Edinburgh in 1832, with the evidence of Principal Lee of that city, and some curious extracts made by him from the old records of kirk-sessions in various parts of Scotland.*

Of course the Sabbath controversy now spread rapidly over the kingdom. Mr HENRY BANNERMAN of Manchester, in an anonymous volume entitled *The Modern Sabbath examined* (Lond. 1832; 8vo, pp. 297), maintained, with no little knowledge and ability, that the Lord's-day is not the Sabbath; while the opposite opinion was skilfully defended by Dr RALPH WARDLAW in his *Discourses on the Sabbath* (Glasg. 1832; 12mo, pp. 295). Of Mr BANNERMAN'S volume the sections are entitled thus: Introduction. 1. The political regulation of a periodical intermission of public labour, distinguished from the law of the Sabbath viewed as a Divine institution. 2. On the supposed transference of the

* These extracts are appended to Principal Lee's Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland, ii. 406; Edin. 1860.

weekly Sabbath from the Jewish to the Christian economy, at the introduction of the Gospel. 3. The Scriptural evidence relative to the existing obligation of the law of the Sabbath further considered. 4. On the views entertained of the first day of the week, during the first ages of the Christian Church; and on the causes which led to the general adoption of the modern Sabbatarian doctrine in England, during the seventeenth century. 5. On the practice of using the Judaical Decalogue as the rule of Christian duty. 6. The grounds on which the modern Sabbath is supposed to rest, examined in detail.—Of Dr WARDLAW'S discourses the subjects are: 1. The origin and universal obligation of the Sabbath. 2. The comprehensiveness, universality, and permanence of the Decalogue. 3. The moral nature of the Sabbath; the duty of holding sacred the entire day; and the evidence from New Testament example of the change of the day. 4. The more direct authority of the New Testament for that change (Heb. iv. 9, 10). 5. The sanctification of the Sabbath; the supposed difference in strictness between the Jewish and Christian Sabbaths considered; and the question how far the Sabbath may be the subject of enactment by human laws, under the Christian economy. 6. The principle, or state of mind and heart, necessary to the right observance of the day; some of the spurious motives from which the merely outward celebration of it may arise; and its public, domestic, and personal duties. 7. The various modes of profanation of the Sabbath. 8. The benefits accruing from its due observance, to individuals, families, churches, and civil communities; and the evils resulting from its neglect and profanation. 9. Means of checking the profanation, and promoting the due observance, of the Sabbath.*—To these succeeded numerous works, the most notable of which on the Sabbatarian side are the following:—*A Treatise on the Authority, Ends, and Observance of the Christian Sabbath, with an Appendix containing a variety of documentary evidence respecting prevalent abuses, and means for their suppression*, by DUNCAN MACFARLAN, minister of Renfrew (Glasgow, 1832; 12mo, pp. 271).—*Horæ Homileticæ*, by the Rev. CHARLES SIMEON, M.A. (Lond. 1832; 21 vols. 8vo). See i. 6; ii. 78; viii. 507; xii. 15; xiv. 500; where he comments on Gen. ii. 2, 3; Numb. xv. 32–36; Isa. lviii. 13, 14; Mark ii. 27; and Acts xx. 7.—*The Presbyterian Review*, vol. i. p. 495 (Edin. 1832); article on the Sabbath, chiefly in reply to Whately.—*A Letter to his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, on the nature of the Christian Sabbath*, by WILLIAM

* The merits of Dr Wardlaw's book are considered by Dr W. L. Alexander, in his *Memoir* of the writer, p. 290 (Edin. 1856). Dr Alexander discountenances the opinion that Heb. iv. 9, 10 refers to a Christian Sabbath on earth; and opposes also some of the views expounded in the discourse on the province of the civil magistrate in relation to the Sabbath. Dr Wardlaw's book is noticed also in *Sabbath Laws*, pp. 57, 219, 329, 508, 541, 546, 547. He treats of the Fourth Commandment in his *Systematic Theology*, iii. 448–456 (Edin. 1857, 8vo).

Bannerman was answered by Josiah Conder in the *Eclectic Review* for April 1832, p. 281.

FOSTER, Vicar of Collon (Dublin, 1832; 8vo, pp. 53).—*An Answer to a Pamphlet entitled "Thoughts on the Sabbath, by Richard Whately, D.D., &c." In this answer the Divine Institution of the Christian Sabbath is vindicated;* by WILLIAM BRUDENELL BARTER, Rector of Highclere, &c. (2d ed., Lond. 1833, 8vo; 4th ed., Lond. 1835, 18mo, pp. 70, in which are briefly noticed some opinions lately advanced by Dr Arnold, head-master of Rugby School); reprinted by Mr Barter in his volume of *Tracts in Defence of the Christian Sabbath, the Church, her Priesthood, and her Sacraments* (Lond. 1851, 8vo).—*The Duty of observing the Christian Sabbath, enforced in a Sermon preached before the University of Cambridge; showing that the primitive Sabbath-day of the patriarchs was modified to suit the circumstances of the egress from Egypt, and that it resumed its original universality and day of observance under the Christian dispensation;* by SAMUEL LEE, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge (Camb. 1833; 2d edition, with many additional notes, Lond. 1834, 8vo, pp. 72); referred to above, p. 45.—*The Sanctification of the Sabbath, and the Blessing attached to it,* by BAPTIST W. NOEL, minister of St John's Chapel, Bedford Row, London (Lond. 1835; 24mo, pp. 53).—*A Letter addressed to the Friends of the Sabbath Cause,* by Sir ANDREW AGNEW, Bart., M.P. (Lond. 1835; 8vo, pp. 24). This explains the objects which Sir Andrew and his friends wished to attain by a legislative measure. "They did not ask," says he, "that the religious observance of the Lord's-day should be enforced by Act of Parliament; but that the law should restrain all from secular employments, which ensnare the consciences of others; should preclude all the competitions for worldly gain, which place the working man at the mercy of an inconsiderate employer, whereby the poorer man in many instances has no other alternative than toil on the Lord's-day, or a starving family; in a word, that the law should protect every man, after six days of labour, in the conscientious observance of one day of holy rest." (P. 11.) The Bill which he brought into Parliament was condemned by many as interfering with the liberty and enjoyment of the poor while it spared the rich; and he himself says, in *A Letter to the Rev. William Lecke,* p. 4 (Glasgow, 1837), that "it is much to be desired for the protection of domestic servants, when beyond the privacy of the house of an inconsiderate master, that the use of private carriages could be restricted," within certain limitations. But no attempt was made to remove this partiality from the Bill. Whether any protection to labourers and servants, beyond what the law of this free country already gives, be necessary, is a point on which opinions differ.—*A Letter addressed to John Wilson Patten, Esq., M.P., on the Removal of Saturday and Monday Markets and Fairs,* by WILLIAM CARUS WILSON, M.A., Rector of Whittington (Kirkby Lonsdale, 1836; 8vo, pp. 16).—*The Scripture Account of the Sabbath compared with his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin's "Thoughts on the Sabbath:" In which the antiquity of the Sabbath is maintained, its permanent obliga-*

tion proved, its meaning explained, its identity with the Lord's Day established, the objections of the Archbishop of Dublin and of several other authors answered, and various topics connected with the principal subject occasionally introduced and examined; by EDWARD STOPFORD, LL.D., Archdeacon of Armagh [and afterwards Bishop of Meath] (Lond. 1837; 8vo, pp. 270).—*The Substance of a Lecture delivered at Worcester, November 7, 1836, on the State of Religion and Morals among the class who gain their subsistence by working upon our rivers and canals, and on the duty of exertion to promote their spiritual welfare,* by the Rev. JOHN DAVIES, A.M., Rector of St Clement's, Worcester (Lond. 1837; 8vo, pp. 34).—*The Presbyterian Review,* articles in vol. x. pp. 334, 708 (Edin. 1838).—*The Perpetuity, Morality, and Christian Observance of the Holy Sabbath,* by FIELDING OULD, A.B., Incumbent of Christ Church, Liverpool (Liverpool, 1838; 12mo, pp. 84).—*A Treatise on the Christian Sabbath,* by RICHARD TREFFRY (Lond. 1838; 12mo, pp. 207).—*Congregational Sermons,* by THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Edinburgh, vol. ii. (Works, vol. ix.), pp. 249–331, Sermons XII. to XV., on the Christian Sabbath, the Christianity of the Sabbath, the advantages of a fixed Sabbath, and the accommodating spirit of Christian charity to the scruples of the weak (Glasg. N. D., 12mo). One of these sermons is referred to above, p. 325, note. Dr Hessey, who quotes and criticises them in his *Bampton Lectures,* pp. 239, 299, 433, and 471, has been accused of misrepresenting Dr Chalmers, in saying that "he deprecated, and, as far as he could, endeavoured to modify, the strictness of a Scottish Sunday;" but I cannot see any ground for the charge.—*Railway Travelling on the Lord's Day indefensible,* by DUNCAN MACFARLAN, minister of Renfrew (Glasg. 1841; 8vo, pp. 32).—*Dissertation on the Sanctification of the Sabbath,* appended to *Exposition of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans,* by ROBERT HALDANE, vol. iii. p. 800 (Edin. 1842).—*The Duty and Privilege of Keeping the Sabbath,* by JOHN BRUCE, one of the ministers of St Andrew's Parish, Edinburgh (Edin. 1842; 18mo, pp. 92).—*The Sabbath Question Illustrated,* by CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH (Lond. 1845; 12mo, pp. 206).—*The Protestant or the Popish Sabbath? a Word of Warning from the Word of Prophecy and the History of the Christian Church,* by the Rev. J. G. LORIMER, Glasgow (Edin. 1847; 12mo, pp. 76); criticised in *Sabbath Laws,* in the index of which see his name.—*The Sabbath Railway System practically illustrated,* by JAMES BRIDGES (4th ed., Edin. 1847; 8vo, pp. 20).—*The Christian Sabbath,* by the Rev. PETER MEARNS; in *Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature,* vol. ii. p. 128, July 1848.—*Scriptural Views of the Sabbath of God,* by JOHN JORDAN, B.A., Vicar of Enstone, Oxon. (Lond. 1848; 18mo, pp. 236). Contents: 1. Institution of the Sabbath, and its principles as developed therefrom. 2. Primeval history of the Sabbath. 3. Law of the Decalogue respecting the Sabbath, and its principles. 4. History of the Sabbath during the Mosaic dispensation. 5. Teaching of Christ and his apostles relative to the Sabbath, and substitution of the first day for the seventh. 6.

Testimony of profane writers to the primitive institution of the Sabbath. 7. Testimony of secular men to the fitness and blessedness of the Sabbath. 8. Practical application of the great principle of the Sabbath.—*Horæ et Vindiciæ Sabbaticæ, or Familiar Disquisitions on the Revealed Sabbath*, by RICHARD WINTER HAMILTON, D.D. (Lond. 1848; 18mo, pp. 212). Contents: 1. The original Sabbath. 2. The Hebrew Sabbath. 3. The Christian Sabbath. 4. The Heavenly Sabbath. 5. The Practical Sabbath. 6. Appendix asserting the positive character of the Sabbath.—*The North British Review*, No. xvi. for May 1848, article 4.—*The Hendersonian Testimony; being five Essays, by working men of Glasgow, on the advantages of the Sabbath to the Working Classes;* edited by the Rev. ANDREW THOMSON, B.A. (Edin. 1849; 12mo).—*Prize Essays on the Temporal Advantages of the Sabbath to the Labouring Classes, and the consequent importance of preserving its rest from all the encroachments of unnecessary labour*, by FIVE WORKING MEN; with Prefatory Remarks by the Rev. E. BICKERSTETH, A.M. (Lond. 1849; 24mo, pp. 211).—*Letter to Joseph Locke, Esq., M.P., in reference to his Bill "to regulate Sunday Travelling on Railways,"* by A SCOTCHMAN (Glasg. 1849; 8vo. pp. 16).—*Transmission, and Delivery of Letters on the Lord's Day demoralising and unnecessary*, by JOHN T. BAYLEE, B.A. (Lond. 1849; pp. 31).—*Dies Dominica: Voices and Admonitions from the old Saxon times; being an Historical Essay upon the Sabbath, from the earliest ages of the Saxon Church to the present day*, by F. SOMNER MERRYWEATHER (Lond. 1849; 18mo, pp. 51).—*Memoirs of Sir Andrew Agnew of Lochnaw, Bart.*, by THOMAS M'CRIE, D.D. (Edin. 1850; 8vo, pp. 442: 2d ed. 1852). Sir Andrew's career is noticed also in Baylee's *Facts and Statistics*, and the places in *Sabbath Laws* referred to in its index, under the head AGNEW.—*The Henderson Prize Essay upon the Advantages of the Sabbath, when rightly observed, to Literary and Professional Men*, by PETER YOUNG BLACK (Glasg. 1850; 8vo, pp. 42).—*The Christian Sabbath considered in its various Aspects, by Ministers of different Denominations;* with Preface by the Hon. and Rev. BAPTIST W. NOEL (Edin. 1850; post 8vo, pp. 467: People's Edition, published by the Religious Tract and Book Society of Scotland, Edin. 1856; 12mo, pp. 404). Contents: 1. The Divine Authority and Early Origin of the Sabbath, its Universal and Permanent Obligation; and the change of the Day from the Seventh to the First under the Christian Dispensation; by RALPH WARDLAW, D.D., Congregational Church, Glasgow. 2. Traces and indications of the primitive Sabbath in many of the institutions and observances of the ancient world; by the Rev. JOHN JORDAN, Vicar of Enstone, Oxon. 3. The Sabbath not a mere Judaical appointment; with an examination of the more prevalent arguments by which it has been attempted to show that the Sabbath law has been abolished or relaxed; by the Rev. ANDREW THOMSON, B.A., United Presbyterian Church, Edinburgh. 4. The adaptation of the Sabbath to the temporal well-being of men, and more especially of the working-classes; with application

of the argument to Sabbath railway travelling; by DAVID KING, LL.D., United Presbyterian Church, Glasgow. 5. The Adaptation of the Sabbath to man's intellectual and moral nature; by JAMES HAMILTON, D.D., English Presbyterian Church, London. 6. Several prevailing forms of Sabbath desecration exposed; by the Rev. PETER M'OWAN, Wesleyan Chapel, Mount Pleasant, Liverpool. 7. The Sabbath a happy day, viewed especially in its influence, when rightly observed, on the religion of individuals; by JOHN HANNAH, D.D., Wesleyan Chapel, Didsbury. 8. Biographical notices on the subject of Sabbath-observance, showing its influence on the piety of individuals; by WILLIAM INNES, D.D., Baptist Church, Edinburgh. 9. The influence of the Sabbath on domestic Piety; by WILLIAM GLOVER, A.M., D.D., Greenside Parish, Edinburgh. 10. Historical notices on the subject of Sabbath-observance, showing its influence on the prosperity of churches; by W. M. HETHERINGTON, LL.D., D.D., Free Church, Edinburgh. 11. Indirect influence of the Sabbath on the general prosperity of nations, and especially on their intelligence, trade and commerce, social order, and liberties; by JAMES SEATON REID, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Glasgow. 12. The sin and evils of Sabbath mails; by ANDREW SYMINGTON, D.D., Reformed Presbyterian Church, Paisley. 13. The law of the Sabbath, the proper statute of religion, identical in principle and invariable in force through all times and dispensations; by the late RICHARD WINTER HAMILTON, LL.D., D.D., Congregational Church, Leeds. 14. The spiritual observance of the Lord's Day; by the late EDWARD BICKERSTETH, Rector of Watton, Herts. 15. The blessing promised on the Sabbath sanctified, and the penalty annexed to the neglect or profanation of it; by STEWART BATES, D.D., Reformed Presbyterian Church, Glasgow. 16. Concluding Practical Address: The Sabbath, its religious observance a national duty and a national blessing; by the Rev. JOHN ANGELL JAMES, Congregational Church, Birmingham.—*A Letter to the Marquess of Clanricarde, Postmaster-General, on the Desecration of the Lord's Day in the Post-Office Establishment; with an Appendix, containing Facts and Remarks on the legalised Desecration of the Day by Railway Companies and Dealers in Intoxicating Liquors*; by R. K. GREVILLE, LL.D., Secretary of the Sabbath Alliance (Edin. 1850; 8vo, pp. 31).—*On the Divine Authority, Early Origin, Universality, and Perpetuity of the Sabbath*; an article in *Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature*, New Series, No. I. for Oct. 1851; vol. i. p. 70.—*The Religious Condition of Christendom exhibited in a Series of Papers prepared at the instance of the British Organisation of the Evangelical Alliance, and read at its fifth annual conference*, 1851; edited by the Rev. EDWARD STEANE, D.D. (Lond. 1852; 8vo). This volume includes articles *On the Desecration of the Lord's Day in Great Britain*, by the Rev. JOHN JORDAN; *On the Observance of the Sabbath in France, and especially in Paris*, by J. H. GRANDPIERRE, D.D., pastor of the Reformed Church, Paris; and *On the State of the Sabbath Question in Germany*, by the Rev. THEODORE PLITT of

Bonn.—*Statistics and Facts in Reference to the Lord's Day*, by JOHN T. BAYLEE, B.A. (Lond. 1852; post 8vo, pp. 285). Contents: The press. Sale of intoxicating drinks on the Lord's-day. Desecration in the Post-office. Railways. Sale of tobacco and snuff. Desecration on canals and rivers. Steamboats. Employment of omnibus-servants and cab-drivers. Smithfield market. Ironworks. Cheese-making. Baking. Metropolitan and City Police. Trading. Adaptation of the Sabbath institution to man. History of efforts to promote the due observance of the Lord's-day, 1831–1851. Its observance in foreign countries. Summary of the statutes for its observance. The Book of Sports.—*The New Crystal Palace and the Christian Sabbath*, by the Rev. JOHN WEIR, minister of the Presbyterian Church, River Terrace (Lond. 1852; 18mo, pp. 31).—*Prize Essay: A Defence of the Universality and Perpetuity of the Sabbath; with a Statement of the Principles of the Sabbath Law and their application to the cases of the Railway and the Post-Office;* by ALEXANDER OLIVER (Edin. 1852; 12mo, pp. 84); noticed in *Sabbath Laws*, pp. 60, 267, 507, 508, 528.—*Lectures on the Sabbath, delivered at the Town-Hall, Woolwich, in March and April* 1852 (Woolwich, 1852; 12mo). Of these seven lectures, six are by ministers, and one by R. D. GRAINGER, F.R.S., who treats excellently of "the adaptation of the Sabbath to the physical nature of man, to his temporal wellbeing, especially the wellbeing of the working-classes."—*The Sunday Steamer: Remonstrance of the Established Presbytery of Glasgow, with the Answer of the Owners of the Steamer "Emperor"*. (Glasg. 1853; 12mo, pp. 12).—*Horæ Sabbaticæ, or the Sabbatic Cycle the Divine Chronometer; a Dissertation to prove the Original Sabbatic Ordinance to be perpetual but not legal*, by RICHARD BALL (Lond. 1853; 18mo, pp. 92); noticed in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, Oct. 1854, New Series, vol. vii. p. 188.—*My Connexion with the Sabbath Movement in France, in* 1853–54, by CHARLES COCHRANE (Lond. 1854; 8vo, pp. 48).—*The Anti-Sabbatarian defenceless, or the Sabbath established upon the Ruins of the Objections of its Enemies*, by the Rev. J. G. STEWART (Glasg. 1854; 12mo, pp. 157); criticised by Domville, ii. 263.—*Physiology in Harmony with the Bible respecting the Value and Right Observance of the Sabbath*, by JAMES MILLER, Professor of Surgery in the University of Edinburgh (Edin. 1854; 12mo, pp. 78). Professor Miller makes a better figure as a physiologist than as a theologian: of his qualifications in the latter capacity an instance was given above, vol. i. p. 199.—*The Crystal Palace; an Essay, Descriptive and Critical;* reprinted from the London *Quarterly Review* (Lond. 1854; 8vo, pp. 73). The opening the "Palace" on Sunday is opposed in pp. 62–70.—*Practical Considerations on the Christian Sabbath*, by the Rev. PETER M'OWAN, 4th ed. (Lond. 1854; 24mo, pp. 143). This writer, after examining Gal. iv. 8–11, Rom. xiv. 5, 6, and Col. ii. 16, 17, concludes, in p. 71, that "these passages, instead of militating against the moral obligation of the Christian Sabbath, strongly corroborate it."—*The Ethics of the Sabbath*, by DAVID PIRRET (Edin.

T. Constable and Co., 1855; 12mo, pp. 242). Contents: 1. Critical remarks, and statement of the argument. 2. The worship of God demands *the appropriation of time*. 3. It demands the appropriation of *a set time*. 4. It demands the appropriation of *an entire day*. 5. It demands *from us* the appropriation of *a seventh day*. 6. It demands *from us* the appropriation of *the first day of the week*. 7. Sabbath worship: The contemplation of nature and the study of science. 8. Sabbath recreation, as a question of right and religious liberty.—This treatise is thoughtfully and logically written, and well adapted to times like the present, when the scriptural authority of the Lord's-day is so frequently controverted, and many are inclined to regard the *natural* grounds for its observance as the most important. Though satisfied of the sufficiency of the *scriptural* foundation, as well as of the argument from *experience* of beneficial consequences, Mr Pirret restricts himself to the discussion of "the dictates of conscience," as a third, and, he thinks, even by itself a satisfactory basis. It is not, however, as a duty recognised *directly and at once* by conscience that he contends for Sunday-observance, but only as "one of those duties strictly moral, *which are discovered by reflection* to result necessarily from some of the fundamental principles of natural morality;" and he lays weight on the fact that the first day of the week is *actually observed* in every Christian country. Whether or not his arguments for the duty of devoting the whole Sunday to the worship of God, are conclusive when applied to the class of religious persons who *can* thus spend it, and who find delight and lasting refreshment in doing so, it is plain that in reference to the multitude who, from weakness, ignorance, stolidity, or a natural want of devotional fervour, are incapable of spending the entire day in such a manner, any conceivable amount of argument must be inadequate to prove a duty which it is impossible to perform. That men of this class exist is undeniable (see above, i. 172, 184, 216, 242, 261; ii. 13–16, 25–27, 83, 76, 130, 147–152, 197, 207, 217, 220, 247, 307, 312, 321), and is admitted by Mr Pirret himself; though he holds that "if there be incapacity for attending during a whole day to the exercises of religion, it must *generally* be attributed not to a natural, but to a moral cause, which involves deep culpability" (p. 111). Notwithstanding his design to avoid the theology of the Sabbath Question, he introduces (p. 25) some remarks on a theological point of considerable importance:—"Numerous expedients of criticism," says he, "are ever ready, and are unhesitatingly employed to get rid of any precept or doctrine that is supposed to be inconsistent with human reason. One example may here be given with reference to the early origin of the Sabbath. It is found not very easy to reconcile, in a natural way, the reason given for the observance of the Sabbath—God's creating all things in six days and resting on the seventh—with its later or Jewish origin. This difficulty is very conveniently got over by simply affirming, though without the shadow of evidence, that the reason must have been *interpo-*

lated. (See Cox's *Sabbath Laws and Sabbath Duties*, pp. 95, 492.)" By the words, "without the shadow of evidence," Mr Pirrot must mean "without satisfactory evidence;" for certainly *some* evidence, good or bad, is adduced in the book referred to. It points out, that in the Pentateuch there are two editions of the Fourth Commandment, each presented as a copy of what was written on stone, but each containing a different reason for the institution of the Sabbath (see Exod. xx. 8–11, and Deut. v. 12–15; and above, i. 109, 155–6; ii. 104–5, 157, 178, 218): now, since two things not equal to one another cannot both be equal to a third, it is clear that if a reason was inscribed with the commandment on the table of stone, and if the Pentateuch in general is authentic history, one of the reasons must, and both may, have been interpolated. But supposing one of these copies of the precept, including the reason annexed, to be accurate, the opinion was submitted, that "we are bound to prefer that given in Deuteronomy, which not only omits the reference to an alleged fact of no special interest to the Israelites at the time, and which science utterly disproves, but, with evident suitableness to existing circumstances, represents the Sabbath as instituted in commemoration of their recent deliverance from Egyptian taskmasters." (*Sabbath Laws*, p. 97.) Again: "That the labours of creation were executed in a very different order, and during an immensely longer time, than the Hebrew narrative represents to us, is now readily confessed and explicitly promulgated even by Scottish writers of unquestionable attachment to the orthodox theology of their country." (*Id.* p. 493; and see above, i. 231; ii. 211, 327.) In proof of the latter fact, reference was made to Hugh Miller's *First Impressions of England and its People*, ch. 17; to which may now be added his *Testimony of the Rocks:* and assuredly no true geologist can now believe, and I know of none who teaches, that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is." I say nothing of Exod. xxxiv., where some find a *third* edition of the Decalogue, in which *no* reason is appended to the Sabbath-law.—*Sermons on the Lord's Day, &c.*, by the Rev. G. J. GOWRING of Banbury (Oxford, 1855).—*The People's Day; an Appeal to the Right Hon. Lord Stanley, M.P., against his advocacy of a French Sunday*, by WILLIAM ARTHUR, A.M. (3d edit., Lond. 1855; 8vo, pp. 44).—*The Church of England Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1855, No. 73, p. 101, article on the Sabbath Question.*—*The British Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1855.—*Man's Right to the Sabbath; the Sabbath made for Man; the Son of Man Lord of it;* a Sermon by ROBERT S. CANDLISH, D.D. (Edin. 1856; 18mo, pp. 72). See above, i. 266.—*The English Sabbath, considered in its Physical, Spiritual, and Social Bearings*, by W. B. MACKENZIE, M.A., minister of St James's, Holloway (Lond. 1856; 12mo, pp. 46).—*The Fourth Commandment not Ceremonial, but Moral*, by HUGH M'NEILL, D.D. (Liverpool, 1856; pp. 50.)—*Sunday*

* Quoted above, p. 205. The opening of the British Museum and National Gallery on Sunday is opposed in the No. for April 1856, p. 455.

Trading in London, its Causes and Remedies; or, the Case of the Tradesmen briefly stated; by A LONDON EMPLOYER (Lond. 1856; 8vo, pp. 28).*—*Three Letters to a Friend on the Sunday Question, viewed chiefly in Relation to its Social and Political Aspects; with a Parliamentary Speech which will not be found in any of the "Debates;"* by N. M. P. [reputed to be HENRY ROGERS.] (Lond. 1856; 8vo, pp. 57.)—*The Lord's Day; the Blessings consequent upon its due observance;* a Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, Nov. 4, 1855, by CHARLES A. HEURTLEY, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity (Oxford, 1856; 8vo, pp. 49).—Article on *The Lord's Day*, in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* for Jan. 1857, p. 265 (Lond. 1857).—*The Sabbath made for Man; or, the Origin, History, and Principles of the Lord's Day;* by the Rev. MICAIAH HILL, Secretary of the Birmingham Town Mission (Lond. 1857; cr. 8vo. pp. 503). Contents: 1. God and the Sabbath. 2. Moses and the Sabbath; the Manna. 3. The Decalogue. 4. Christ and the Sabbath. 5. The Apostles and the Sabbath. 6. Christianity and the Sabbath. 7. Morality and the Sabbath. 8. The Physiology of the Sabbath. 9. Hallowing the Lord's-day. 10. Historical Survey of the Sabbath. 11. Sabbath observance and Sunday desecration in Europe and America.—*The Typology of Scripture, viewed in connection with the entire Scheme of the Divine Dispensations*, by PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D., Professor of Divinity, Free Church College, Glasgow; Book III. chap. ii. sect. iii., On the Weekly Sabbath, vol. ii. p. 118; and Appendix A, On the Views of the Reformers regarding the Sabbath, vol. ii. p. 475. (3d ed., Edin. 1857; 2 vols. 8vo). The 1st ed. was published in 1847. —*The Lord's Day is the Sabbath of the Lord; a Sermon in reply to "The Lord's Day* NOT *the Sabbath," by the Rev. C. P. Reichel, D.D.;* by the Rev. HENRY HENDERSON, Holywood (Belfast, 1859; 8vo, pp. 27).—*The Patriarchal Sabbath, the Jewish Sabbath, and the Lord's Day; a Sermon in reply to Dr Reichel,* by the Rev. JOHN WRIXON, M.A., perpetual curate of Malone (Belfast, 1859; 8vo, pp. 39).—*Observations on the Rev. Dr Reichel's Sermon, entitled, &c.*, by the Rev. ALEX. IRWIN, M.A., Precentor of Armagh Cathedral (Dublin, 1859; 8vo, pp. 89).—*The Lord's Day the Sabbath; a Lecture in reply to Dr Reichel,* by the Rev. JOHN MACNAUGHTAN, A.M. (Belfast, 1859; 8vo, pp. 60.)—*The Christian Sabbath*, in reply to Dr Reichel, by the Rev. WILLIAM O'NEILL, Prebendary of St Michael's, Dublin (Belfast, 1859; 8vo, pp. 111).—*I. The Church of England on the Fourth Commandment, or an humble attempt to ascertain the sense in which the Church of England holds the Fourth Commandment to be obligatory on her members: And, II. The Word of God on a Seventh day Sabbath, or an humble attempt to ascertain the Teaching of the Scriptures on a day of holy rest obligatory upon man by divine authority;* by the Rev. FRANCIS EXTON, M.A., late Scholar of St John's College, Cambridge, curate of Filby, Norfolk (Camb.

* A Report by a Select Committee of the House of Commons, on Sunday Trading in London, was ordered to be printed, 15th July 1847.

1860; 8vo, pp. 48). It is here shown that in the Service for the public baptism of infants, the Catechism, the proceedings at Confirmation, and the Ante-Communion Service, the Church of England plainly affirms the Ten Commandments to be obligatory *in some sense or other* upon Christians; and that the obligation is recognised also in the Injunctions issued in 1536 and 1538, the Bishops' Book, A.D. 1537, the King's Book. A.D. 1543, the Injunctions of Edward VI. A.D. 1547, and the Articles of Visitation by Archbishop Cranmer in the second year of that king; that it was recognised before the Reformation, in the ninth of Peckham's Constitutions at Lambeth, A.D. 1281, and the first of Archbishop Nevill's Constitutions, A.D. 1466; and that hence the introduction of the Fourth Commandment into the Communion Service in 1552 cannot be regarded as the introduction of a new doctrine into the Church, or even as the statement for the first time of a doctrine previously held. It is next inquired, *In what sense* is the commandment considered obligatory by the Church? Not, replies Mr Exton, as to *the day*, but only as to *some fixed day*, which in her case is the first day of the week. "The petition, 'Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law,' can be used only with the understanding that there is some fixed day of holy rest, which we may misuse or neglect; and the fact that the first day of the week has always practically borne that character amongst us, coupled with the fact that our Church has never endeavoured, nor even so much as hinted a wish, to bestow it upon the *seventh* day, must lead all reasonable men to conclude that she considers the observance of the first day as a day of holy rest, to derive *some* sanction from the Fourth Commandment; that, from the abrogation of the seventh day the moral requirements of the Commandment pass on to the first day of the week; that there is an essential moral analogy between the first day and the seventh; so that the moral conditions of the latter, as expressed in the Decalogue, are now inherited by the former" (p. 12). It is further maintained, that the Church declares the law of the Lord's-day to be divine, not ecclesiastical, although she directs holy days and festivals to be kept *in the same manner* as Sunday. In the second part of the pamphlet, Mr Exton advocates a primeval Sabbath, universal and perpetual, the day being changed by Christ.—*The North British Review*, No. 67, Feb. 1861, art. 9.

To the works above specified may be added numerous tracts published by the (London) Lord's Day Observance Society; the Sabbath Alliance, instituted at Edinburgh Nov. 1, 1847; the Religious Tract and Book Society of Scotland (Edinburgh); the (London) Religious Tract Society; Mr PETER DRUMMOND of Stirling; and the Rev. DAVID C. A. AGNEW, minister of the Free Church, Wigtown, a son of Sir Andrew.

On the *Dominical* side, again, the principal treatises published during the last thirty years are the following:—*Thoughts on Materialism, and on Religious Festivals and Sabbaths*, by HENRY

BRADSHAW FEARON (Lond. 1833; 8vo, pp. 214). This writer treats of, 1. Heathen and Jewish festivals; 2. The Jewish Sabbath; 3. The Lord's Day, or Christian Sabbath; and, 4. A National Sabbath. He discusses sundry opinions of Paley, Dwight, Whately, Dr S. Lee, and others; and agrees with Spencer and Vitringa that rest was the only Sabbath duty *commanded* to the Jewish laity (pp. 170–175). The book was answered by Dr Lee in an appendix to the 2d edition of his Sermon mentioned in p. 339.—*Brief Animadversions on a Pamphlet by Dr Richard Whately, entitled "Thoughts on the Sabbath,"* by BIBLICUS (Dublin, 1833; 12mo, pp. 28). Biblicus was JOHN WALKER, some time a Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, and a clergyman in the Establishment, but who afterwards became a Separatist. The tract is reprinted in his *Essays and Correspondence*, edited by William Burton, vol. ii. p. 143 (Lond. 1846, 8vo). Agreeing with Whately that the Lord's-day is not the Sabbath, he denies the power of any "Church" to sanctify days; charges the Archbishop with confusing his argument by employing the word *church* in three different senses; and thinks the example of the apostles a sufficient law to Christians for the observance of the Lord's-day. The *leading* purpose of the weekly assembling of the apostolic Christians is held to have been the showing forth Christ's death in the ordinance of his Supper (Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xi. 17, 20), and his resurrection by the day of their meeting.* Throughou this tract Mr Walker prefers to call that day *the first day of the week*, rather than *the Lord's-day*. "The former," says he, "continually occurs in the Scriptures of the New Testament; the latter is to be found there only in the one passage, Rev. i. 10, and it is more than doubtful whether it be there employed to mark any particular day of the week, though I am aware that such an application of it is very common in ecclesiastical writers posterior to the Apostolic age. Certainly, '*the day of the Lord*' is used in very different applications, in other parts of Scripture, both of the Old Testament and of the New" (p. 23). See other passages, in his *Essays*, i. 228, 326, 370, 559; ii. 74–77, 415, 429, 443, 499, 505–7.—*The Mosaic Sabbath and the Christian Sabbath contrasted and explained; a clear, full, and free Discussion, earnestly offered, in the present public circumstances, to the consideration of the British Nation and its august Senate*, by J. L. CHIROL, A.M., one of His Majesty's Chaplains, and minister of the Church called Le Quarré, Little Dean Street, Soho Square, London (Lond. 1834; 8vo, pp. 84).—*Mistaken Views regarding the Observance of the Sabbath*, by ALEX. MARJORIBANKS, 7th ed. (Lond. 1840; 18mo, pp. 72).—*Sabbatism no part of Christianity; a Discourse preached in Union Street Chapel, Glasgow*, by JOHN TAYLOR (Glasg. 1842; 8vo, pp. 14). This was opposed by EDDOWES BOWMAN, in *Arguments against the Divine Authority of the Sabbath, contained in a Discourse, &c., considered, and shewn to be inconclusive* (Glasg. 1842;

* There is a pamphlet entitled *An Essay on the Obligation of Christians to observe the Lord's Supper every Lord's-day*, by J. M. CRAMP (Lond. 1824, 8vo, pp. 62).

8vo, pp. 14); to which Mr TAYLOR replied in *The Sabbath; a Letter to Mr Eddowes Bowman* (Glasg. 1842; 8vo, pp. 16).—*Sunday no Sabbath*, by CHARLES LARKIN (Newcastle, 1842; 8vo, pp. 53); answered in *Remarks, &c.*, by WILLIAM TAYLOR (Tynemouth, 1842; 18mo, pp. 34).—*Exercises, political and others*, by Lieut.-Colonel (afterwards General) T. PERRONET THOMPSON, vol. v. pp. 103 sqq. (Lond. 1842).—*Sermons*, by THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D., Head Master of Rugby School (Lond. 1844; 3 vols. 8vo); Sermon xxii., On the Lord's Day, in vol. iii. p. 251. It is here taught that even if the patriarchs were commanded to keep the Sabbath, "a thing which we can never know," this would be no rule for us: for if the Law itself be done away in Christ, much more the things before the Law. The Sabbath, then, may have been necessary to the patriarchs; but it would not follow that it is needed now, when we have outgrown even the Law. "But," proceeds Dr Arnold, "I must go somewhat further; for I know the real question is, Are we right in keeping the Sunday, or are we not right? The fourth commandment does not answer this question by itself; no, not though it be used every Sunday in our own service. For we do not keep the fourth commandment, seeing that we do not keep holy the seventh day, but the first; not the day on which God rested from all his works, but the day on which he raised up Jesus Christ from the dead. And as to altering a command of the Law, he must know little of the obedience which the Law requires who could think that men might alter it at their discretion. Further, if we look into the Catechism of our own Church, we shall find the question asked of the child, 'What dost thou chiefly learn by these commandments?' and the answer is, 'I learn two things; my duty towards God, and my duty towards my neighbour.' Now it is clear that the duty towards God is learned from the four first commandments; the duty towards our neighbour, from the six last. The question then goes on—'What is thy duty towards God?' or, in other words, What is the lesson taught by the four first commandments? And the answer, as we may all remember, says not one word of keeping the Sabbath; it is not this, according to our Catechism, which we learn from the fourth commandment, but 'to worship him, to give him thanks, to put our whole trust in him, to honour his holy name and his word, and to serve him truly all the days of our life.' It does not then appear, merely from our reading the fourth commandment in our Church service, that we are obliged to keep it, without question, as the law of God to us, and to keep holy the seventh day, while we do, in fact, keep holy the first. All this, I think, is quite true; and yet we are bound to keep holy the Sunday; and it would be great wickedness or great folly to give up the observance of it. We are bound by the spirit of the fourth commandment, because we are not fit to do without it. God commanded his people, in the old times, to keep holy the Sabbath day. He commanded them this when they were very ignorant, and very worldly-minded; when, had he told them to worship him every day in the spirit, they would have

spent every day without worshipping him at all; their hearts were too hard for a devotion so pure. Now, God having given this command to his people, it is manifest, that so long as they are in the same state as when he gave it them, they are bound to keep it; so long as the same sickness remains, they will need the same remedy. It was intended that the Gospel should put us in a very different state, so that we should need the command no more. It was intended so, and St Paul hoped fully that it would be so; and therefore he writes to the Colossians, 'Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.' Such were his hopes for his fellow Christians, and to show that God designed them to be free from the Law, the command, in its letter, was kept no more; the seventh day, the Jews' Sabbath, was no longer observed by Christians. But St Paul's hopes were disappointed, and the gracious designs of God were thwarted. The state of Christians was not changed; the old sickness was not thrown off; and therefore the old remedy was still needed. As, then, the change of the day from the seventh to the first shows us what God designed for us, shows us the heavenly liberty to which we were called; so the long and unvaried practice of the Church in keeping the first day holy, shows us their sad feeling and confession that they were not fit for that liberty; that the Law, which God would fain have loosed from off them, was still needed to be their schoolmaster." And if there be any so full of the spirit of Christ as not to need for himself the aid of carnal ordinances, yet, says Dr Arnold, the duty of not becoming a stumbling-block to the weaker brethren would bind him to observe the Lord's-day. Dr Arnold's views are further stated in several letters published in his *Life* by A. P. Stanley (Letter 66, to his Sister, June 11, 1833, 5th ed. vol. i. p. 364; and Letters 231–233, to W. L. Newton, Esq., Feb. 1840, vol. ii. p. 206). To Mr Newton he writes on the question about railway trains on Sunday: these he thinks should be *fewer* than on other days, but not wholly discontinued. For extracts and observations, see Hessey, pp. 12, 187, 191; and Cox, pp. 221, 281.—*Feasts and Fasts: an Essay on the Rise, Progress, and present State of the Laws relating to Sundays and other Holidays, and Days of Fasting; with Notices of the Origin of those days, and of the Sittings and Vacations of the Courts;* by EDWARD VANSITTART NEALE, of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-law (Lond. 1845; 12mo, pp. 436).—*A Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, edited by JOHN KITTO, D.D. (2 vols. 8vo, Edin. 1845); two articles in vol. ii. on the *Lord's Day* and the *Sabbath*, by the Rev. BADEN POWELL, Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford.*—*First Day Sabbath not of Divine Appointment; with the Opinions of Calvin, Luther, Belsham, Melancthon, Bar-*

* In the second edition of the *Cyclopædia* an article on the *Sabbath*, more accordant with the views of the Puritans, has been substituted for Mr Powell's.

clay, Paley, and others: a Letter to the Committee of the Edinburgh Emancipation Society, by H. C. WRIGHT (Glasg. 1846; 8vo, pp. 48). "The question at issue," says he, "*is not*, Are men to consecrate *first day* to God? I believe they are bound to do so: also, that they are equally bound to consecrate every other day to God. *It is not*, Were the Jews required to observe the *seventh* day as a Sabbath? They were; and were subjected to the penalty of death if they did any work on that day (Ex. xxxv. 1, 2). *It is not*, Is the assembling of ourselves together for instruction and improvement in things pertaining to the kingdom of Heaven profitable for man and acceptable to God? I believe such meetings are useful, and necessary to our growth in grace and divine knowledge. *It is not*, Is it a good regulation of society to appropriate first day to rest and relaxation from bodily toil? I believe such an appropriation of that day to be wise, and most useful, and perfectly consistent with the Christian system, and with the laws of our physical nature. *But*, Does Christianity consecrate the *first*, or any other day of the week, as a *Sabbath?* Or, Is the *first day* Sabbath of human or divine appointment; and its observation based on *expediency* or divine authority? This, alone, is the question to which I would call attention." Again: "The natural fruit of the Sabbatarian principle, as it is now understood, is to associate, in the minds of its adherents, the presence and government of God with a *day*, rather than with their own hearts and lives, and with their fellow-men, and to give a fitful, periodical tone to their sobriety and devotion, to their regard for man and their zeal for God. When first day comes round, they appear more solemn, more devout, more humble, more penitent; a more sacred and subduing reverence for God comes over their minds on this than on other days, because they regard it as the Lord's day, in a higher and holier sense than other days; and when first day is past, they are apt to feel that the 'holy day,' the *Sabbath*, is past, and man's secular days are commenced. Reverence for God is not on their minds on second, as it was on first day; they do not feel His controlling power to-day as they did yesterday; the 'Lord's day' is gone, and much of the restraining sense of His presence is gone with it; and their minds turn with avidity to what are called secular pursuits and pleasures. Under the influence of the fatal delusion that first day is set apart, by Divine appointment, more ESPECIALLY for religious purposes than other days, they do not associate their daily employments with their Christian character, and spiritual destiny, as they do the employments which are said to be appropriate to the day of rest. They seem to be seeking the Kingdom of God and His righteousness on first day; but manifestly are in pursuit of very different objects the rest of the week. What they call Christianity, instead of being in them as a fountain, springing up into daily and everlasting life, goes and comes as the days roll round."—*Sunday Trains on the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway: Reasons why we voted for the Resumption of Sunday Trains* (Glasg. 1847, pp. 15); combated by the Rev. Dr EADIE in

the *United Presbyterian Magazine* for July 1847; a *Reply* to whom was published by the authors of the pamphlet (Glasg. 1847; 12mo, pp. 12). In the *Reply* it is said: "Again, Dr Eadie writes as follows: 'Their opinions are clear, but their aim is awful. It is to deprive a weary and exhausted world of all sanction for its day of rest and refreshment, save that of mere expediency, and to tell the Church that Sabbath-observance with us is an act of superb folly and gross superstition, for in it we are neither revering nor obeying Divine authority.' But where has he gathered that we desire to abolish the Sabbath, or weaken its sanctions? There is not an expression in our whole pamphlet justifying such an inference; but, on the contrary, several which ought to have effectually barred every assumption or imputation of this description. The true question between the Sabbatarians and us, is not whether a Sabbath shall be kept, but whether a day shall be employed in special or formal observances, flowing from and in consequence of a dictum of supposed Divine authority; or whether it shall be employed with *intelligent reference to its uses*, in order that the world may repose and repair itself. . . . Dr Eadie thinks little of these last sanctions, calling them by what with him is evidently the low name of *expediency*. Now, what is expediency? According to our estimation, chiefly an expression for the manifest uses of an act or regulation; and will the learned Professor inform us what sanction can possibly be higher or more sacred? Is not the good that flows from any deed or institution the clearest manifestation that such deed is a duty—a distinct command of the Almighty? or would he hold as more sacred a commandment without reason assigned?—a course of action not recommended by its suitableness to forward man's happiness and exalt his character?" —*Letter to the Rev. Dr Candlish of Edinburgh, on the Word of God as to the Jewish Sabbath and Sunday* (Lond. 1847; 8vo, pp. 40).—*Sunday Railway Travelling: The History and Nature of the Sabbath, as contained in the Scriptures, and in the Writings of Calvin, Luther, Milton, Jeremy Taylor, Paley, and others;* by EDINENSIS (Edin. 1847; royal 8vo, pp. 16). The "others" are Channing and Higgins, the former of whom, after observing that there are appearances of the institution of the Sabbath at the beginning of the human race, proceeds: "We know that these are faint and few; yet we attach importance to them, because nature and reason favour the supposition of a time having been set apart from the first as a religious memorial. Whilst, however, we incline to this view as most probable, we see no proofs of the perpetuity of the institution in the circumstance of its early origin. On the contrary, an ordinance or rite, given in the infancy of the human race, may be presumed to be temporary, unless its unchangeableness is expressly taught, or is necessarily implied in its very nature. The positive or ritual religion which was adapted to the earlier, can hardly suit the maturer periods of the race. Man is a progressive being, and needs a progressive religion. It is one of the most interesting and beautiful features of the sacred writ-

ings, and one of the strong evidences of their truth, that they reveal religion as a growing light, and manifest the Divine Legislator as adapting himself to the various and successive conditions of the world." In some concluding observations the author of the pamphlet says: "It is very satisfactory to find that no writer argues for the abolition of the day of rest. All agree in its utility, and earnestly uphold its observance *within the bounds of law and reason*. . . . Injury may be done to society by imposing a Sabbatical strictness which is beyond the power of human nature, in general circumstances, to bear. . . . A tree is best known by its fruits. What are these in the present instance? The protracted effort to enforce a stern Sabbatical observance, *per fas et nefas*, has no doubt evoked an exceedingly decorous state of affairs on Sunday; but in a great measure *only as far as external appearances are concerned*. If Sabbatical observance is to do any good at all, it must surely render the mass of the people more honest, virtuous, temperate, and refined, than they would be under a less severe discipline. But will any man have the courage to affirm, that the Scotch are in these respects superior to their neighbours in England, or to the people of continental Europe generally? Will it be said that English merchants, from their tolerance of Sunday railway communication, possess less integrity in all the relations of life, or are worse Christians, than the tradesmen of any Scottish town whatsoever? Puritanism, with its uncompromising demands, has had a sway of three centuries in Scotland; and yet, at this moment, in proportion to the population, the amount of crime, vice, and intemperance, is as great, if not in some details greater, than it is in England. But the most frightful feature of Scotland is the loathsome squalor and heathenism of its large towns. The combination of brutal iniquity, filth, absence of self-respect, and intemperance, visible daily in the meaner class of streets of Edinburgh and Glasgow, fills every traveller with surprise and horror; and we can confidently say that in no city of the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Germany, or any other country which it has been our fortune to visit, have we ever seen such a scene of demoralisation. The truth is, Scotland has too long deceived itself with the fancy, that it is either the most virtuous or the most religious of countries. Sabbatical observance, which has been put forward as if it were the only test of godliness, has been to it a delusion and a snare. It has substituted forms and appearances for the moral and religious culture of the heart, as well as for the actual individual conduct. Away, we say, with this sinful distortion of ethics. Let it be taught that piety before God and morality before men—that true and undefiled religion—the religion of our blessed Redeemer, as propounded by himself and his holy apostles, is something else than the affected consecration of a gloomy decorum one day in seven, or the formal listening to sermons during a few hours in the week. In short, this most dangerous practice of representing Sabbath-observance as the all in all of Christianity—for such would really seem to be what Sabbatarians

are driving at—must be broken up, and the genial spirit of the New Testament infused into the whole concerns of life."—*The Lord's Day* NOT *the Sabbath; an Inquiry into the Teaching of Scripture on the subject: In a Letter to the Rev. R. S. Candlish, D.D.*, by FRANCIS RUSSELL, Esq., Advocate (Edin. 1847; 8vo, pp. 40). The author was a deacon in a Free Church congregation of which Dr Candlish is the minister, and resigned his office in consequence of a change of opinion regarding the Lord's-day. His pamphlet is an able exposition of the grounds of his new belief. "The writer," he observes, "has reason to believe that there are some minds, either engaged in a struggle between inherited prepossessions and personal convictions, or oppressed by a feeling of solitariness, to whom the confession of a similar experience may perhaps bring aid and comfort; and the manner in which the views which are here disclosed have been publicly spoken of by persons of influence, in many different spheres, as being untenable, extravagant, and unchristian, seems to require an explicit avowal of the opinions which are thus denounced, and a statement of some of the reasons by which they are supported; even were not the duty already imposed on the writer, of making known, in some form or other, his dissent from a doctrine of which he had made a public profession. Besides, such a publication of the conclusions at which the writer has arrived seems called for by the circumstance that they have been very much lost sight of by the two classes of disputants who have maintained the extreme positions on either side; the one contending, that because the Lord's-day does not come under the law of the Sabbath, there is therefore no obligation on Christians to observe it at all; the other class arguing, or assuming, that it will not, in point of fact, be observed, unless on the basis of the Fourth Commandment. The necessary effect, if not the design, of this is, to cast upon those who believe that the Sabbath, as being a Jewish Institution, has no application to Christians, but yet regard the observance of the Lord's-day, for its uses, to be a duty no less than a privilege, the odious imputation of being actuated by motives the very reverse of those which have, in truth, determined their opinions, and regulate their conduct. By this unjust imputation, they come to be identified with those persons who desire, for selfish ends, to take from their dependent and toilworn fellows those most blessed seasons of rest and refreshment, for body and spirit, which are essential to Man's wellbeing; and all the more necessary during an era, when incessant outward activity and busy superficial life give little opportunity and less inclination for retirement, and prayerful thought. The writer's earnest wish is, not to diminish these precious hours of quiet, but, on the contrary, to add much to them. . . . It is to be lamented that an institution so valuable as the Lord's-day, and for the continued observance of which by Christians such conclusive reasons can be alleged, should have been perilled, by the attempt to find a foundation, and the chief foundation for it, in the law of the Sabbath given to the Jews; an

attempt which to many minds must appear very unsuccessful and delusive. . . . The writer does not, of course, participate in the alarm with which some persons, for whom he cannot but feel respect and affection, look forward to the extension of such views as are stated in this Letter; on the contrary, he desires to have the persuasion inwrought into the whole texture of his thinking, that what is *true* cannot ultimately be harmful; that, in the words of the Chevalier Bunsen, 'All Good and Truth are in the highest sense identical. He who does not believe that all things good and true are Christian, has no proper faith in Christianity; and whoever is afraid of them is, if not unbelieving, yet of very little faith.' . . . I make no pretension to any acquaintance with the literature of the question. Indeed, I have read very few treatises against, and almost none—not even Whately's—in support of the views I have been led to adopt; for, had I waited for the aids of this literature, I must have been prepared to traverse a very large theological field. Such as they are, my opinions have been chiefly the result of my own reflection upon the whole teaching of Scripture on the subject, with the addition of some well-known, and, I believe, quite unquestionable facts of history; and as my object is to explain to you my own convictions, and the grounds of them, I shall avoid all reference to other authority. I am aware, indeed, that on this subject there has been anything but unanimity among Protestant divines, and that the views adopted by Knox,* and nearly universally received in Scotland, ought to be stated as the exception, not the rule, with the Reformers and the Reformed Churches; and although this is not the ground of my opinions, the knowledge of it may have so far influenced me as to give me courage to enter on a question from which I might possibly have started back, as one already prejudged, had there been any general consent of commentators. . . . Just one observation I must make in regard to the practical result of my convictions. I now regard the Sabbath as removed out of the law of express enactments into the higher law of Christian expediency. For myself, I do not know that my change of view will imply any change whatever in my employment of what I have been used, and continue to regard as means of spiritual improvement to be very highly prized. What would be the consequences of the general prevalence of these opinions I am unable to say. One is naturally apt to look forward to such changes with anxiety, if not with alarm; but the result does not always verify such anticipations. I think far too much weight has been attached to the importance of the view generally received in Scotland, and that the comparisons made, to the disadvantage of continental countries, are perhaps not much to be relied on. There may be a far greater

* Mr Russell here falls into the common mistake of supposing that Knox was a Sabbatarian. The contrary is shown in *Sabbath Laws*, p. 123; and *The Sunday League Record*, p. 209. Dr Hessey has adopted the correct view in his *Bampton Lectures*, p. 268. See also above, i. 127.

amount of formalism among us, connected with this belief, than we are accustomed to think. To fix the comparative *moral* statistics of different nations is clearly a most difficult, if not quite an impossible problem; and so many elements of error must ever enter into the products thus obtained, that I think they ought to be used with great modesty. . . . Should one be told that such and such views are 'purely infidel,' and that holding them he can be no Christian, he may deplore such rash anathemas, and tell his uncommissioned judges that the very opinions which they conceive themselves entitled thus to pronounce upon have been, and are held by very many learned, and wise, and Christian men, and by not a few of the best and wisest. Indeed, such expressions as those referred to do seem very inexcusable when it is considered that *if* the law of the 'Sabbath' can be established as a part of Christian doctrine, this can only be done (on the admission of all candid persons who have studied the question) by an elaborate argument, which must ever be a very bad foundation for any such denunciations. Whatever be the immediate issue of any discussion that may arise on this subject, I am unwilling to doubt that, ultimately, what I believe to be 'true,' will prove itself 'pure.' For myself, I desire to enter on all such inquiries, and to conduct them, under the consciousness of standing at each moment in judgment before God—a reflection which, while it must liberate from thraldom to any human authority, may well induce candour, seriousness, and humility." Mr Russell's answer to the argument from Mark ii. 27 for the universality and perpetuity of the law of the Sabbath, is quoted in *Sabbath Laws*, p. 509. In his Appendix, Note F., he gives extracts from M. Bailly and others to show that "there is more than considerable probability for the opinion that the week, like the other divisions of time, had an astronomical origin—being suggested both by the quartering of the lunar month, and by the 'seven planets,' from which among the Indians and Chinese, as well as among the Egyptians, and among ourselves, the days of the week have derived their names."—*The Law and the Gospel*, by the Rev. BADEN POWELL, in Kitto's *Journal of Sacred Literature* for April 1848, vol. i. p. 326; answered in an article on *The Christian Sabbath* in the same journal for July 1848, vol. ii. p. 128, by the Rev. PETER MEARNS; to whom Mr POWELL replied in an article in the Number for the ensuing October, p. 253, *On the Application and Misapplication of Scripture.** Mr Powell re-

* In Kitto's Journal for July 1849 (vol. iv. p. 140), there is an article on "the second Sabbath after the first" (Luke vi. 1), by J. VON GUMPACH; and the Number for October 1850 (vol vi. p. 437) contains "Observations on the verb בָּרַךְ BÂREK, "to bless," the radical meaning of which, the writer, after adducing a great many examples of its use in the Bible, concludes, is to *signalise, distinguish, make eminent.* He thus renders Gen. ii. 3: "And God distinguished—signalised—the seventh day, and did set it apart."

published the substance of his two papers in a volume entitled *Christianity without Judaism* (Lond. 1857; post 8vo, pp. 263).—*The Sabbath* [vol. i.]; *or, an Examination of the Six Texts commonly adduced from the New Testament in proof of a Christian Sabbath;* by a LAYMAN [Sir WILLIAM DOMVILLE, Bart.] (Lond. 1849; 8vo, pp. 338): *Supplement* thereto (Lond. 1853; 8vo, pp. 36). Contents: 1. Introductory Remarks. 2. Examination of the six texts adduced from the New Testament in reference to the observance of the Sunday as a Sabbath. 3. Examination of the six texts in reference to the observance of the Sunday, not as a Sabbath, but as a stated day of assembling for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction. 4. Result of the examination. 5. Counter-evidence. 6. Of the Practice and Example of the Apostles with reference to the religious observance of the Sunday. 7. Examination of the non-scriptural evidence adduced in proof of a Christian Sabbath: The Epistle ascribed to Barnabas; the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians; the Epistle of Pliny to Trajan; the Apology of Justin Martyr. 8. The origin of Sunday observance,—(1.) as a Sabbath; (2.) as a day of public worship only. 9. *Supplement*, containing additional evidence that no ecclesiastical writer of the first three centuries has attributed the origin of Sunday observance either to an injunction or the example of the Apostles, or to any precept from Christ himself; and that they were at a loss to account for its origin.—This volume, and a second which Sir William published in 1856, are in my opinion the most valuable contribution made in this century to the literature of the Sabbath Question. The acute and *thorough* manner in which every point is handled, the careful research and consideration that appear throughout, and the perfect candour and courtesy with which the Sabbatarian writers are treated, give ample warrant for the eulogy of Arthur Helps, who says, "It is one of the ablest controversial works I ever read, written in the soberest and most pious spirit, with an abundance of learning admirably brought to bear upon the subject." (*Fraser's Magazine*, Jan. 1856, p. 7.) Some extracts, &c. above inserted (i. 121, 154; ii. 31, 45, 179, 180, 184, 261–7), exemplify the quality of the book, which, I may add, has not been answered, though it was *noticed* in the *Church of England Quarterly Review* and the *British Quarterly Review*, both for January 1855. Mr W. H. Johnstone, in the preface to his tract on *Sunday and the Sabbath* (Lond. 1853), which, according to his own statement, was originally intended as a review of Sir William's first volume, calls it "clever, but sophistical;" yet he unaccountably abstains from attempting to show wherein the sophistry consists, and, after employing the very arguments which Sir William has laboured to *prove* sophistical, concludes by acknowledging that the Scripture by itself does not afford conclusive evidence that the consecration of Sunday was sanctioned by the apostles! "We are not prepared," says he, "to assert that these six texts, if they stood alone, would settle the point; but we do not scruple to use them as apostolical authority, when we find such clear cor-

roborative testimony to the meaning we would fix upon them, from the custom of the Church in the next succeeding age" (p. 47). Now, it is not so much this *custom*, as *the ground anciently assigned for it*, that is important; and Sir William has clearly shown in his Supplement, that, among the various and sometimes fanciful reasons given by the early Fathers for the practice of assembling on Sunday for worship, neither the command nor the example of Jesus or his apostles is ever once mentioned.—*The Christian Sabbath and the Post-Office, a discourse occasioned by the new postal arrangements*, by JAMES CRANBROOK, minister of the Unitarian Church, Birmingham (Lond. 1849; 12mo, pp. 24). The theological ground of Lord's-day observance being in Mr Cranbrook's opinion untenable, he thinks that were it placed on a *natural* foundation its utility would be increased, especially to the labouring classes.—*The Christian Sabbath, a Tract for the Times*, by a MINISTER OF CHRIST (Warwick, 1850; 12mo, pp. 24).—*Israel after the Flesh; the Judaism of the Bible separated from its Spiritual Religion;* by WILLIAM HENRY JOHNSTONE, M.A., chaplain of Addiscombe (Lond. 1850; 8vo, pp. 308). Contents: 1. The Old Covenant. 2. Federal institutions. 3. Holiness. 4. A future state. 5. The faith of Israel. 6. Rabbinical errors. 7. The Judaism of Jesus. 8. Christian Jews. 9. Israel in the future. The views expressed in this book are off the beaten track, and, in reference to the Sabbath, the 7th and 8th chapters in particular deserve attention. The observance of the Lord's-day is advocated on grounds apart from the law of the Sabbath; which law, moreover, is held to have enjoined only cessation from work, as the mode of keeping it holy, and nowhere to have required attendance at public worship thereon. (Pp. 139, 214). The author thinks that neither Jesus nor his apostles abolished Judaism, which therefore may still co-exist with Christianity, as it did among the Apostles themselves. As to the Sabbath, he observes: "Before the destruction of Jerusalem, the *Jewish* Christians kept both the Sabbath and the Lord's day, and therefore did not regard the meaning of the two to be identical. It is also evident that the Sabbath was not considered binding upon *Gentile* Christians, for two reasons: first, if it had been, it would certainly have been mentioned as one of the necessary things in the Apostolic decree; and secondly, a Gentile, if poor, and especially if a slave, could not have observed the Sabbath in a heathen country. The magistrate would have forced him to work. . . . Were there no *natural* reason for observing a day of rest, the fourth commandment would have no claims upon us. But there *is* natural reason. For, even waiving the two facts; first, that the artificial division of time into weeks was not confined to the Hebrew nation; and secondly, that the only additional service enjoined in the Law was a holocaust, and therefore not of Jewish significance; we have the truth, universally admitted, that the Christian day of rest is a vast blessing to mankind. Hence, as soon as we are satisfied that a general violation of the Sunday would induce evil, then it follows that any

one's individual violation helps that evil, and is consequently *sin*, according to St Paul's definition (Rom. i. 18 and vi. 23). And yet it seems unaccountable that, if this were so, the founders of the Christian church did not perpetuate the observance. To this it may be answered; first, that their not doing so no more removes our obligation, than their not promulgating a decree concerning perjury, sanctions false or profane swearing; and secondly, that it was manifestly impossible for Christians to observe a general day of rest, while the state remained antichristian; and therefore the first few generations of believers were not instructed to look upon a Sabbath as necessary. It would appear as if, for some years, things were in this condition. The great body of Christians knew of no Sabbath, but kept their religious meetings on the first day of the week. Afterwards, when Christians sat on the tribune, and hoped to wear the purple, the duties of the Jewish Sabbath were transferred to the Sunday, for two reasons, the one a worthy, and the other an unworthy one. The first was the evident good which a holy day of repose effected; the second was the misapprehension that the Mosaic Law was a spiritual, eternal Law. . . My own convictions are firmly settled, that it is the duty of us all—a duty that may not be lightly considered—to refrain from our secular occupations, and to bless God in the congregation, on the Lord's day. But so long as these duties are regarded as morose, burdensome, and unnatural, so long will religion maintain only a secondary rank in social estimation." (Pp. 214–216). The book is noticed in Kitto's *Journal of Sacred Literature* for April 1852, p. 187.—*Sabbaths: an Inquiry into the origin of Septenary Institutions, and the authority for a Sabbatical Observance of the modern Sunday; revised by the author, and reprinted from the Westminster Review for October* 1850 (Lond. 1850; 8vo, pp. 56). This pamphlet is noticed in Kitto's *Journal* for October 1851, p. 70. Its reputed author is Mr W. E. HICKSON, who edited the *Westminster Review* in 1850; and it is included in a work mentioned below, entitled *Time and Faith*, 1857.—*The Sunday not the Jewish Sabbath; in a Letter to Sir Andrew Agnew, Bart.: together with Calvin on the Jewish Sabbath, or Seventh day of the Week* (Lond. 1850; 8vo, pp. 38 and 16).—*The Whole Doctrine of the Sabbath, as set forth in the Holy Scriptures, in the writings of the Fathers, and by the most eminent Reformers and orthodox modern divines; in opposition to the prevailing errors and delusions of the present time;* by J. W. [JOHN WAUCHOPE] (Edin. 1850; 12mo, pp. 24: new edition, entitled *The Sabbath Handbook: the Whole Doctrine, &c.*, Edin. 1851; 12mo, pp. 60).—*Sunday Trains may lawfully be used, and Sunday Letters may lawfully be written and delivered;* by A CHRISTIAN, BUT NO FANATIC (Lond. 1850; 18mo, pp. 24).—*The Post-office and the Sabbath Question* (Lond. 1850; 8vo, pp. 20).—*The Sabbath; four Discourses*, by WILLIAM M'KEAN, Unitarian minister, Oldbury (Lond. [1851]; 12mo, pp. 88).—*The Sabbath, the Crystal Palace, and the People*, by JAMES BALDWIN BROWN, A.B., minister of Claylands Chapel, London (Lond. 1853; 18mo, pp. 36).—*Sermons on the*

Sabbath Day, &c., by FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, M.A., Professor of Divinity in King's College, London (Lond. 1853; 12mo, pp. 127). Sermon I. The Old Testament Sabbath; II. The New Testament Sabbath; III. The Crystal Palace. In the last of these, Mr Maurice states why he cannot with so many of the clergy protest against allowing the Crystal Palace to be open to the public on Sundays; and objects to the sense in which the phrase "religious duties" is usually employed.—*The Crystal Palace and the Golden Day; or Sunday Blessings to Body and Soul;* by EDWARD HIGGINSON: reprinted from the *Christian Reformer* for Jan. 1853 (Lond. 1853; 8vo, pp. 20).—*Sabbath Laws and Sabbath Duties considered in Relation to their Natural and Scriptural Grounds, and to the Principles of Religious Liberty*, by ROBERT COX (Edin. 1853; 8vo, pp. 600). This is not a methodical treatise, but a discursive ocasional production, which in its passage through the press increased from an intended pamphlet to a goodly volume. Hence the whimsical appearance which the arrangement of its matter presents. It was called forth by the stoppage of Sunday (morning and evening) trains for passengers on the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway, by Directors helped into office by Sir Andrew Agnew and his friends, and who were defended on theological grounds by clerical shareholders at meetings of the Company. This entire suspension of the means of communication between two great cities for a whole day in the week is objected to by the writer, as alike at variance with the conditions on which the Company got its powers from the Legislature, and unwarranted either by a rational interpretation of Scripture, or by regard to the public good. The volume contains articles headed thus:—A Plea for Sunday Trains on the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway. The Victories of the Sabbatarians. The Right to act according to one's Religious Belief. God's Truth and Man's Truth. The Duty of preserving Health. History of modern Sabbatarianism. Clerical Dogmatism and Lay Servility. Public Opinion in Scotland as to Sunday Trains. Grounds of Legislation for Sunday Trains. The Causes and Cure of Drunkenness. Recreation a Sabbath Duty. God's Vengeance against Sabbath-breakers. The Scottish Memorials against Sunday Trains. Protestant Principle and Protestant Practice. The Duty of acting according to one's Religious Belief. Curiosities of the Sabbath Alliance. The Scriptural Grounds of the Sabbath.—To the multifarious topics here discussed, and facts collected, for the use of students and disputants, guidance is afforded by an ample table of contents and a copious index. The book is noticed in the *Westminster Review* for Jan. 1854, p. 241, and April 1856, p. 429; also in the *Church of England Quarterly Review* for Jan. 1855, p. 103. The writer says to his fellow-shareholders: "We all agree that although the Fourth Commandment expressly forbids those who are bound by it, to do any work whatsoever on the Sabbath-day, a strict and literal interpretation of it would be unreasonable, inasmuch as *total* abstinence from labour is not only inexpedient but beyond our power. We all perform, or countenance others in performing,

many kinds of labour on every Sunday in the year. It is rare to meet with any one who objects to the doing of certain kinds of work on Sunday by sailors, ferrymen, physicians, surgeons, domestic servants, coachmen, ostlers, dairymaids, scavengers, policemen, lamplighters, and persons in attendance at gas works, chemical works, smelting furnaces, and I might add malting houses, were it not that the large and respectable sect of 'total abstainers' see no need of making malt either on Sunday or Saturday. In short, it is admitted that works of necessity and mercy may and ought to be performed on Sunday; and it may safely be affirmed further, that a hearty desire is prevalent among all parties that labour of this kind should be restricted within the narrowest limits that circumstances will allow, and that, by suitable arrangements (like those formerly adopted upon our railway when the passenger trains were run, and still, I believe, in use with respect to the trains which carry the Sunday mails), it should be made to fall as lightly and as seldom as possible upon individuals. But here we reach the critical point where disagreement begins;—we come to the question, What is the meaning of that well-worn phrase, 'works of necessity and mercy?' What works or classes of works does it include and sanction? Who is to determine whether a certain act, which somebody in certain circumstances proposes to do, but which another man tells him he ought not to do, does or does not in reality fall within the limits of these privileged classes of works? . . . I assert the right of every man to determine freely for himself what (within the limits already pointed out) he may do upon Sunday, consistently with his religious duty; if he err in his decision, he is responsible to God alone. Now, it is perfectly well known that numerous cases occur in which people judge it right and proper to travel on Sunday. No statistics are necessary to prove that; for when our Sunday passenger trains were run, they were actually used to a moderate extent by the public, and at this day the public avail themselves, to a similar extent, of the Sunday trains on every Scotch railway which affords the accommodation. In a populous district like ours there cannot fail to occur, so frequently that non-occurrence is the exception and not the rule, cases where travelling is required for the performance of the duties of benevolence, relationship, and friendship, the duty of preserving health and strength of body and mind, nay, even the duty of attending the ordinances of divine worship—for the last of these was the motive which induced many persons resident near the railway, and who either were not within reach of a church, or had not one of their own denomination in their district, to travel regularly to Edinburgh, Glasgow, Falkirk, and other places, in the Sunday trains formerly run upon our line. And who will deny that every one of these persons was entitled to decide for himself whether it was consistent with his duty so to travel? Just consider for a moment the endlessness of the controversies as to the extent to which the Fourth Commandment delivered to the Jews is binding on Christians,—how such controversies have

abounded from the days of the apostles down to our own times, and have elicited the expression of the most diverse opinions from men all excellently qualified by learning, ability, and integrity, to judge in the matter. In the face of such facts as these, is it not astonishing that in this so-called enlightened age and Protestant country, any party of religionists should assume the position of infallible interpreters of the divine law, whose dicta must regulate not merely their own conduct (as it ought to do), but also the conduct of their fellow-mortals who cannot see with their eyes, or discover the right of any man among them to sit in Moses' seat? Contrast the effects of our present railway arrangements with the working of those which existed under the former *régime.* Then, every man was free to follow the dictates of his own conscience: if he thought he had a good reason for travelling on Sunday, he travelled; if not, he staid at home. But in these later times no such even-handed justice is dealt out to the community; for although he who objects to Sunday travelling is still as completely at liberty as ever to remain at home, he who wishes to travel must hire a special conveyance at an expense which it is ten to one he cannot afford, or stay at home against his will. . . . The question, let me say once more, is not, 'Shall the Sabbath be observed in Scotland?' I know of no man who desires the abolition of the weekly day of rest—an institution so plainly adapted to the bodily, intellectual, and emotional wants of human nature, that any attempt to abolish it among us would be a ridiculous failure. What I oppose is not the observance of the Sabbath, but that kind of observance of it which some call its 'better' observance, and others its 'bitter,' and puritanical, and UNCHRISTIAN observance—a mode of observance which, in the opinion of many earnest friends of religion, is much less calculated to promote respect for so admirable an institution, than to excite a general distaste at religion itself, and to drive multitudes into the *unmistakeable* Sabbath-desecration of vicious indulgence." As to breach of faith with the public: "I beg you to consider what sort of reception Parliament would have given to our bill if its preamble had set forth, not simply, as it did, that we were to furnish 'additional means of communication,' but that we were to give additional means of communication upon six days of the week, while on Sundays it would be our religious duty to withhold even such limited means of communication as the public were at that time actually enjoying in the form of two mail-coaches, which the opening of the railway would of course entirely put a stop to. Will any man of business deliberately assert, in his character of a man of business, that the Legislature would ever have sanctioned such a proposal as that? And if not, how can we escape the imputation that for several years we have been abusing our powers by doing what the Legislature never intended or expected us to do—what the promoters of the bill never contemplated we should do—what a large body of the public would have successfully opposed our being empowered to do—and what we have therefore

just as little legal right as we have reason and justice, to support us in doing?" It is also an aim of the writer "to recal the attention of divines and serious laymen to the much neglected but increasingly fruitful field of Natural Religion. From its diligent culture there is reason to hope for a rich harvest of good to mankind; in particular, we may learn in it more and more how to spend beneficially the leisure of the Sabbath." The volume is quoted above, i. 240, ii. 96, 845; and is frequently referred to throughout.—*Sunday and the Sabbath; or, the Reasons for identifying the Lord's-day of the Apostles with the Sabbath of Moses*, by WILLIAM HENRY JOHNSTONE (Lond. 1853; 18mo, pp. 82). This treatise is noticed above, p. 357, and in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, New Series, iv. 191.—*Sermons in Glass; or a Sunday Visit to the Crystal Palace Defended: with a Peep behind the Scenes at the Sabbatarians, especially in Scotland* (Lond. 1854; 8vo. pp. 36).*—*The Remains of* EDWARD COPLESTON, *D.D., Bishop of Llandaff; with an Introduction, &c.* by RICHARD WHATELY, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin (Lond. 1854). At p. 124 is an extract from Dr Copleston's common-place book, respecting the Sabbath; see also p. 51 of Whately's Introduction.—*The Sabbath Question in Relation to the Cabmen's Strike; a Lecture delivered in St Mark's Chapel, Edinburgh, on Dec.* 31, 1854, by JOHN GORDON (Edin. 1855; 12mo, pp. 24).—*The People's Sunday; a Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Robert Grosvenor, M.P., on his late Sunday-Trading Bill*, by AN OXFORD M.A. (Lond. 1855; 8vo, pp. 24).—*The Sabbath* [vol. ii.]; *or, an Inquiry into the Supposed Obligation of the Sabbaths of the Old Testament*, by Sir WILLIAM DOMVILLE, Bart. (Lond. 1855; 8vo, pp. 271). A chapter in this volume, entitled "The Mosaic Sabbath," and arguing that the Fourth Commandment is not obligatory on Christians, was published separately as a pamphlet with a like title (Lond. 1850; 8vo, pp. 46). See remarks on the previous volume, above, p. 357. The contents of the second are as follows: I. On the Mosaic Sabbath. II. On the Sabbath alleged to have been commanded at the Creation, and which will be entitled "The Creation Sabbath:" 1. The sanctification of the seventh day, Gen. ii. 3; 2. God's rest on the seventh day, Gen. ii. 3; 3. The text in Genesis proleptical; 4. No mention in Scripture of the observance of a Creation Sabbath; 5. Refutation of the Sabbatarian reply that circumcision is not mentioned after the settlement of the Israelites in Canaan, and the Mosaic Sabbath not till 500 years after its institution; 6. Examination whether Exodus xvi. 23 ("To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath"), is evidence of the Sabbath having been known before the time of Moses; 7. Examination of alleged Scriptural allusions to the observance of a Creation Sabbath, and particularly of that which is founded on the early division of time into weeks; 8. No mention in Scripture of the seventh day having been accounted sacred,

* The opening of the Crystal Palace on Sundays is advocated also in the *Westminster Review* for Oct. 1854, p. 543.

except in reference to the Mosaic Sabbath; examination of alleged heathen testimony to the sacredness of the seventh day; 9. On the alleged improbability that mankind should be left for 2500 years without a Sabbath institution; 10. The Creation Sabbath a tenet of modern times. III. On the moral equity which, it is alleged, arises out of the Fourth Commandment, obliging Christians to devote one day in every seven to God's service, although the command may be in no other respect obligatory upon them: 1. Statement of the moral-equity tenet; the tenet not supported by the Jewish or Christian Scriptures; 2. Doing no work on the Sabbath-day fulfils the Commandment; 3. Sacrifice the only form of worship as a religious duty in the time of Moses; the whole people could not attend upon it on the Sabbath-day; 4. Scripture reading and holy meditation no duty of the Sabbath in the time of Moses; 5. Synagogue worship not essential to the due observance of the Sabbath-day; concluding remarks on the moral-equity tenet. —*The Sunday Band at Eastbourne; a Statement addressed to the Inhabitants, by the Promoter of the Sunday Band* [Sir W. DOMVILLE, Bart.] (Lond. 1856; 8vo, pp. 16).—*Speeches delivered in the House of Commons, Feb.* 21, 1856 [by Sir JOSHUA WALMSLEY, Sir J. V. SHELLEY, Mr MURROUGH, Mr JAMES HEYWOOD, Lord EBRINGTON, and Lord STANLEY], *in favour of Sir Joshua Walmsley's motion for opening the British Museum, &c., on Sunday afternoon; revised by the several Members* (Lond. 1856; 8vo, pp. 16). The motion was lost by 376 to 48 votes.—*Speech of* Mr ROUNDELL PALMER *in the House of Commons in opposition to Sir Joshua Walmsley's Motion* (Lond. 1856; 8vo, pp. 12).—*An Englishman's Letter to the Evangelicals on the Sabbath Question* (Lond. 1856; 8vo, pp. 20). —*The Sabbath of Paul and Jesus; or the Christian Day of Rest: two Discourses delivered at Finsbury Chapel, London, March* 1856, by HENRY IERSON, M.A. (Lond. 1856; 12mo, pp. 32).—*The Sabbath Question fully and impartially considered, in a Series of Ten Letters*, by ARTHUR BALDWIN CLIFFORD (Lond. 1856; 8vo, pp. 81). Contents: 1. The Sabbath of the Ancients. 2. The Sabbath of the New Testament. 3. The Sabbath of the early Christians. 4. The Sabbath of the Christian Church from the time of its connection with the State. 5. The Sabbath of the Church of Rome. 6. The Sabbath of the early Protestant Reformers. 7. The Sabbath of the Puritans. 8. The Sabbath as observed by different Protestant communities and states. 9. The moral and physical results of Sabbath strictness. 10. Things connected with the Sabbath controversy. This writer (who, I believe, conceals his real name) discusses the subject with intelligence and moderation, as the following extracts from Letters VIII. and IX. will show: "I do not wish Englishmen to imitate, in their Sunday conduct, any of the people whom I have named. To ask for that would be to ask for what is not possible. Englishmen are neither Swiss nor Swedes, Germans nor Dutchmen; and they could not, even if it was desirable, make a good attempt to do as they do. When people, therefore, talk of turning the English Sabbath into a Continental Sunday, I am dis-

posed to think that they talk without much meaning. For my part, I suspect that our best way of proceeding would be to permit amongst our people, between the hours appointed for public worship, the liberty of enjoying themselves in any way they think proper, provided public morality was not infringed, or servile labour imposed upon large numbers. . . . It is a curious fact, and one well meriting attention, that all persons who speak of those communities where recreation on the Sunday is practised by the people, remark their sobriety as something worthy the imitation of Englishmen and Scotchmen. Laing is very decided in his language when speaking of the sobriety of the Swiss; and Scott points out, with approval, the conduct of the Danes in this respect, and contrasts it with the drunkenness of the British.* I do not say positively that this difference is attributable to the way in which the spare time of the people is spent; but I do say, that constant work for six days of the week, and an attempt to suppress all innocent recreation on the seventh, is not unlikely to lead to an indulgence in habits like that of drinking, which may be gratified privately, and without reproach, up to a point when all sense of shame vanishes, and when, therefore, reproach is of no use. But I refrain from entering on an inquiry of this kind, because I know how difficult it is speak with correctness as to the true causes of national vices or virtues. In fact, nothing can be more unsatisfactory than the theories men invent to explain their own virtues and their neighbours' vices, except, perhaps, the ridiculous consequences that timid or interested people predict as the inevitable results of all human conduct of which they may disapprove. Many men assume the right to prophesy, and the confident dogmatism of the prophet is in exact proportion to his blindness and ignorance. . . . At Sabbath-observance meetings, and in Sabbatarian tracts, predictions of evil, as the inevitable

* Mr Clifford quotes Laing's *Notes of a Traveller*, pp. 324, 326, 327 (Lond. 1842); *The Danes and the Swedes*, by Charles Henry Scott (Lond. 1856); and, as to the Dutch and Germans, Cox's *Sabbath Laws*, pp. 55, 216, 369. For further information respecting Sunday on the Continent, see the last-mentioned work, pp. 215, 277, 415, 558; Hessey's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 248, 252, 454; Williams's *Through Norway with a Knapsack*, 2d ed., p. 321; *The National Sunday League Record*, pp. 24, 25, 30, 31, 63, 81, 89, 146, 182; and the works referred to above, p. 312, in the note. See also pp. 308–311, 353, and 355 of this volume, and the notice of the Articles of the Synod of Dort, in the Supplement to vol. i.

The following eloquent passage in one of Dr Arnold's letters, written at Cologne in June 1828, describes a people among whose continental descendants the Puritan Sabbath has never gained a footing: "Far before us lay the land of our Saxon and Teutonic forefathers—the land uncorrupted by Roman or any other mixture; the birthplace of the most moral races of men that the world has yet seen—of the soundest laws, the least violent passions, and the fairest domestic and civil virtues. I thought of that memorable defeat of Varus and his three legions, which for ever confined the Romans to the western side of the Rhine, and preserved the Teutonic nation—the regenerating element in modern Europe—safe and free." (*Life*, ii. 377, 5th ed.)

consequence of Sunday music, are commonly to be met with; and the illiterate prognosticator—although he may know nothing of the past, and next to nothing of the present—reads the future with as much confidence as if his only mission in the world was to exclaim with Cassandra—

> ' * * * Lend me ten thousand eyes,
> And I will fill them with prophetic tears.'

But let us not be alarmed! The future progress of the world is under a higher and better control than ours; and our duty is not to falsify the past, nor to aim with too much solicitude to control the future; but rather, to do, with singleness of heart, and honesty of purpose, whatever may appear in our own eyes useful, necessary, and innocent; doing our act honestly, and leaving to God to assign to it its value in the scheme of His providence. . . . It would be as wrong to urge that bands of music, or other out-door Sunday recreations, should be adopted as a proper substitute for the church or the chapel, as to say that the church or the chapel should supersede out-door Sunday recreations. There is no necessary antagonism between a Sunday band of music and the church or chapel service; a person may very properly attend to both, and be improved by both; or he may attend to both, and be improved by neither; but, at the same time, it may be asserted safely, that a man should have the privilege of preferring the one, and rejecting the other, without being looked on as a hypocrite; or he might, one would think, be considered capable of enjoying Sunday music without incurring the title of reprobate, sinner, or infidel."—*Sunday the Rest from Labour*, by A CHRISTIAN: dedicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Lond. 1856; post 8vo, pp. 523). Contents: 1. General view of the subject. 2. The Divine object of the appointment of a day of rest. 3. Origin of the British Sabbath. 4. Influence of Sabbatarian Religion on the masses of society. 5. Religion and the Gospel of Jesus.—The author thinks that Sunday was the primeval Sabbath-day; that the Fourth Commandment enjoined merely rest from toil, so that work was the only "profanation" of the Sabbath; that the *early* Jews held no meetings on it for religious worship; that the Gentile Sunday has no connexion with the Sabbath; that although public worship is nowhere appointed in the New Testament, nor is any evidence there to be found that the Lord's-day was observed by the apostles, yet public worship may in the present state of Christendom be profitably engaged in by some,—but there are no sacred places, and the present inanimate ceremonial of the Church of England must give way to a real and living worship; that all acceptable worship is spiritual and private, without any outward form or any public performance; and that religion is a life, a being, and not an institution. The book is earnestly written, by one who states that he has seen much of the working classes, as well as of the clergy, and whose tone of treatment of the subject is in accord-

ance with his Christian profession.*—*The Westminster Review* for April 1856, p. 426; article V., on "Sunday in Great Britain."—*A few Answers to the Arguments put forward at the great meeting in St George's Hall, Liverpool, Jan.* 20, 1856, *in defence of the Sabbath* (Lond. 1856; 8vo, pp. 48).—*The Sunday Questions: or, How Sunday came; how to use it best; and how to legislate (and not legislate) about it;* by EDWARD HIGGINSON: from the *Christian Reformer* for April and May 1856 (Lond. 1856; 8vo, pp. 26). Mr Higginson is convinced that "the *safe* ground, as it is the reasonable ground, on which we may rest all that we may fairly desire or demand respecting the observance of a day of exemption from work, is its importance to the well-being of man. Some persons," says he, "fear that if the stringent divine *authority* of the day be given up, it may soon come to be claimed as a working day like the other six. I do not fear this. It has become, by the usage of Jewish, Christian, and Mahometan countries, one of the great *vested rights of the labourer*, no less than one of the chief spiritual blessings of all religious hearts. The labourer knows that the addition of a seventh day of work would not permanently add anything to his earnings. He therefore cannot be tempted to forego his Sabbath. The employer of labour believes, too, that six days of toil, thus intermitted and relieved by the seventh, are as effective as seven would be without such interval. He therefore is under no temptation to invade, if he could, his workman's Sabbath. Nor has the world so soon forgotten the experiment actually made by revolutionary France, when the seventh day was abolished by law as a day of rest and worship, and a tenth day was instituted instead, as a merely secular holiday. Neither as workers nor as worshippers could the French be prevailed upon to accept this more stinted rest, and the seventh-day Sabbath returned to them. Physiologists confirm the latter proportion as more appropriate to the needs of the human body than the other, which is too little; nor does Religion think this too much for the higher wants of the mind and heart and soul. I am under no apprehension, therefore, that the Sunday's rest should come to an end by the relinquishment of an untenable, though imposing, argument on its behalf; but I am greatly apprehensive that the continued assertion of the absolute divine authority of Sunday, the representation of its due observance as consisting in gloom and asceticism, the insisting upon prohibitions which are unnatural and galling, and especially such as deny to the humbler classes pleasures and recreations which the higher classes are at the same time enjoying, together with the wild de-

* The following work opposes views more extreme than those above noted:—*A Reply to Apeleutherus: I. On Religious and Moral Instruction; II. On Public and Social Worship; III. On Supernatural Revelation; IV. On a Future State: In which his arguments to prove that Sabbaths, Ministers, and Public Worship are useless and ought to be abolished, are examined and refuted;* by JOHN BENTLEY (Lond. 1819; 8vo, pp. 234). See the controversy between Gilbert Wakefield and his opponents, above, p. 270-321.

nunciation of divine judgments as impending on the non-observance of what is not plainly incumbent, or even of what is impracticable;—all this, I do indeed fear, must tend to lower the Sunday not only in the respect, but yet more in the love, of those who would cherish it as a blessing, and might, while feeling it to be such, be encouraged, in various degrees and ways to improve it." Our legislators, he urges, "should aim at giving to every person, as far as possible, the *uncontrolled use of his Sunday*, so long as he uses it without infringing the equal liberty of his neighbours. Legislation of some sort, to some extent, we must have, even to secure a simultaneous cessation from labour. But its purpose should be to enfranchise, not to repress—to secure to every one, as far as possible, the enjoyment of a day of leisure; but not to enforce upon him any particular way of spending it. On this principle, though it is the legislator's duty to secure freedom in the use of the Sabbath, it follows that he must not lay an absolute prohibition upon the voluntary exercise of such secular callings as are necessary to enable the bulk of the community to enjoy the free use of the day. . . . Were he to stop public carriages on roads and railways, and not to stop private carriages also (which Sabbatarians never seem to contemplate doing), he would be calling the rich man's evil good, or else the poor man's good evil. If he closes those exhibitions of nature and of art which tend to refine and improve the mind, against such as have no hope of seeing them except on their day of rest, he is again grossly partial to such as can visit those public stores from day to day, and also recreate themselves with similar treasures of their own on Sundays. And he grossly wrongs religion by thus acting. These, then, are the acts that the legislature should *not* do. And for the same reasons, any other bodies of men who have the control of public institutions adapted to innocent, healthful, and improving recreation, should regard themselves as put in trust, not to enforce their own Sunday practice upon other persons, but *to give to each* person, as far as possible, the power of acting upon *his own sense* of what is right or allowable. The majority of the proprietors of the Manchester Botanical Gardens, for instance, who now (*conscientiously*, no doubt) keep them closed on Sundays, should remember that the opening would not compel them to walk there, but that the closing does prevent the minority from walking there. Let the minority become the majority (as it soon probably will), and then, for the first time, all the subscribers will have equal liberty of conscience. At present the general conscience is oppressed by the particular conscience, so called. But the 'religious people,' so called, are sad defaulters here in the high court of morals. They have no conscience for other people's consciences."—*The Lord's Day*, by WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D., Vicar of Leeds (now Dean of Chichester) (Lond. 1856; post 8vo, pp. 94). This is a sermon on Col. ii. 16, in which Dr Hook, like Whately, maintains that the Lord's-day is an ordinance of the Church, divinely authorised to establish it. "The question," says he, "is not whether the Lord's Day is an institu-

tion appointed under the Divine authority; this we shall presently prove it to be. But the question is, whether God has ordered us to keep holy the first day of the week. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are undoubted ordinances of God; we can quote the chapter and verse in which we read of their being ordained by God. But as to the Lord's Day, we are not able to refer to a single passage in all the Scriptures of the new Testament in which the observance of it is enjoined by God. If we refer to tradition, tradition would not be of value to us on the point immediately under consideration. The Romanist regards the tradition of the Church as of authority equal to that of Scripture. But we are not Romanists. The mere Protestant professes to reject tradition altogether. But we are not mere Protestants. The Church of England uses the tradition of the early Church, to enable her to read doubtful Scriptures correctly, just as an old man may put on spectacles to discover the characters of the Sacred Volume; but as the man with spectacles, though helped, can only read what is written, so the Church of England, while seeking the assistance of tradition, accepts as revealed truth only what is stated in Scripture: the Bible, rightly interpreted, and the Bible only, is our authority. But on this point there is not even tradition to support us. There *is* indeed a tradition on the subject of the Lord's Day, to which we shall presently advert. But there is no tradition that God ordained the first day of the week to be a Sabbath, to be kept in the same way as the seventh day was kept by the Jews. The assertion is usually made at the present time under another form; we are told that the Sabbath being an ordinance of God, all that is said in the Old Testament upon the subject of the Sabbath is binding upon Christians, the day merely being changed. But this is a purely modern assertion. The change of the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday was never mentioned, or, as far as I can discover, thought of by the early Christians. The Sabbath, that is to say, the observance of Saturday as a day to be devoted to God's service, to rest of body and repose of mind, was an ordinance of God. This ordinance relating to Saturday could be changed by God and by God only. We, as Protestants, must appeal to the Bible, and the Bible only, to ascertain the fact that God has changed the day—that God has Himself substituted Sunday for Saturday. . . . It is said that we find traces in the New Testament of a reverence paid to the Lord's Day, and that such reverence was countenanced by the conduct of the apostles. This we not only admit but assert. It is an important fact, to be employed as an argument, presently. But the question before us is not, whether the Lord's Day is to be kept with reverence, but whether it is a Sabbath substituted by God for the Jewish Sabbath. Two instances (Acts xx. 6, 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2) occur in the New Testament which seem to confirm the tradition of the Church that the Lord's Day has been kept as a holy day from the apostolic age. But that is not the question at present before us. The question before us is, whether there is any authority in Scripture for the

common assertion that the Sabbath has been changed by God, or at God's command, from the seventh to the first day of the week. It is no answer to this to say that the apostles seem to have sanctioned the assembly of Christians for public worship on the Lord's Day, or that St John in the Apocalypse speaks of the Lord's Day, and may possibly allude to the Sunday festival. For this is one of those arguments which prove too much. We ourselves keep Easter Day; this is no proof that we do not keep Christmas Day, or that Easter has been substituted for Christmas. And if we have instances of the first day of the week being kept holy by the apostles, we have more instances of their observing the Jewish Sabbath. So that if we were to refer to the example of the apostles only, we should be obliged, in consistency, to keep holy both the Saturday and the Sunday, as was frequently done in the early ages by some portion of the Church; the Saturday being still called the Sabbath, the Sunday being called the Lord's Day." Further on he says: "The Levitical Dispensation, was the schoolmaster which led us to Christ. To those that are in Christ the schoolmaster is no longer required. The Christian Church is to act upon principles: God does not any longer direct us how the principles are to be carried out into action. He has instituted the Church, which is empowered by Him to make regulations for the purpose, the regulations varying with the varying circumstances of time and place. . . It is true that we are not more bound by an ordinance of the Patriarchal Dispensation than we are by an ordinance of the Mosaic Law. But we are not inquiring now as to an ordinance, but as to a principle. And when we find that under former dispensations, when God directly interfered with the affairs of man, He required at least a seventh portion of our time to be devoted to Him, we cannot fail to conclude that this is as much a principle of revealed religion as public worship. Public worship, as we have observed, is a principle of revealed religion; it is for the Church, with Scripture in her hand, to decide how it is to be performed. The dedication of one day in seven to be a day of bodily and mental rest, and to be a day of Divine worship, is a principle of revealed religion: the Church has decided that our seventh day of rest and worship shall be the first day of the week. How or when this day was selected to be what we now, without danger of being misunderstood, may call the Christian Sabbath or Lord's-day, we know not. The origin of the institution is lost in the mist of distance. We only know that there never was a time or Church in which the Lord's-day was not observed as a religious festival.* We have no account of its institution in the Scripture; but we find the Apostles observing it. It was natural that it should be observed from the beginning; because it is the

* Dr Hook's meaning probably is, that we *do not know* that there *ever was* a time or Church in which he Lord's-day was not so observed. If we knew that there *never was* such a time or Church, we should know that the origin of the institution was coeval with the origin of the Christian Church.

day when our Lord and Master rose in triumph from the grave. giving proof of an accepted Atonement and a Heaven reopened to mankind: and it is the day on which the Third Person of the Ever Blessed Trinity assumed His office of Paraclete, to prepare for the reopened Heaven the people whom the Father hath given to the Son." In answer to the question whether the day is desecrated by recreation or amusement, he refers to the design of the festival, "which is, that it be a day of public worship, and, in relation to this, of mental repose and bodily rest. Such being the case, we answer at once, that recreation, *as such*, is not inconsistent with a religious observance of the Lord's-day; neither so was it considered by the Reformers,"—as the conduct of Parker and Aylmer, of which examples are given, shows. After arguing from Luke xiv. that recreation was not excluded from the idea of the Jewish Sabbath, he observes that "this was the principle observed throughout the Christian world—the toleration of recreation not inconsistent with the design of the Lord's-day—until the prevalence of Puritanism, towards the close of Queen Elizabeth's reign. The Puritans asserted first that the Lord's-day was not an ordinance of the Church, but a continuation of the Jewish Sabbath, and then, in opposition to the Church, they represented it as profaned by every species of amusement. They were driven to this unscriptural course by the exigencies of their position. For if the Church has power to appoint one festival, it has power of course to appoint others. But being determined not to observe the festivals of Christmas and Easter, and being at the same time determined to keep the Sunday, they went from the New Testament to the Old, and, to remove themselves as far as possible from the Church, what the Church observed as a festival they converted into a fast. Hence all the logical confusion to which allusion has been made in the first part of this discourse." With respect to Sunday amusements, Dr Hook observes further:—"It is quite clear that all amusements for which money is paid must have a tendency to convert the Sunday into a working day. If we pay for amusements, a large number of persons will be compelled or induced to work. There will be a demand for work that we may be amused, and avarice will meet the demand. In saying this, then, do we not find the principle for which we are seeking? Paid-for amusements are to be resisted, on social grounds as well as religious, because they must lead to labour. But we must go further. If we would prevent a demand for the kind of recreation which would lead to consequences which we deprecate, we must provide, as far as in us lies, unpaid-for recreation for the working-classes. Under the present excitement of feeling upon this subject, I shall not enter upon details, further than to remark that no object can be presented to the eye more innocent or more lovely than that of a family—father, mother, children—recreating in the fields at eventide in the summer months. Let, then, our fields and parks be open. And as there must be temptation in an alehouse, and as there can be no sin in reading, why should not our libraries be

made accessible in the winter? I would ask yet further, why should not our Church services be made more attractive, not by the introduction of foolish imitations of bygone usages, but by the artistic performance of that sacred music peculiar to the Church of England, and which is unequalled in any other Church? It is folly to disregard the inferior motives; and hundreds who have been brought within the sound of the Gospel, attracted first by the music, have remained to pray, as this large congregation can bear witness." In the Appendix, extracts are given from Bishops Sanderson, Cosin, Bramhall, Nicholson, Taylor, and Horsley, and from Paley and Coleridge. Part of the quotation from the last is as follows: "I sincerely wish to preserve a decent quiet on Sunday. I would prohibit compulsory labour, and put down operas, theatres, &c., for this plain reason, that if the rich be allowed to play, the poor will be forced, or, what comes to the same thing, induced to work. I am not for a Paris Sunday. But to stop coaches, and let the gentleman's carriage run, is monstrous."—Dr Hook was addressed by "A London Clergyman," in *Remarks* on his pamphlet (London: Bell & Daldy, 1856; 12mo. pp. 12). The main purpose of this friendly critic is to represent, that "you would have strengthened your own cause, if, while allowing that we are *bound*, on a principle of revealed religion, to dedicate one day in seven to be a day of bodily and mental rest, and to be a day of Divine worship, you had not stated also that we establish, by precisely the same argument, the Divine authority of the Lord's-day and the Divine authority of Confirmation." It is however to be observed that Dr Hook hardly goes so far as to say that we are *bound* to act on the so-called "principle." His words, in page 27, are: "Here we have a principle on which we *are* to act;" that is (as I understand him), which suggests to us the like observance as proper for ourselves. But in like manner, are we not to act also on many of the Mosaic laws which are not in the Decalogue? Is ablution of the body less "a principle of revealed religion" than its repose on the seventh day?* Dr Hook's remark on the authority of Confirmation (in his 11th page) is adverted to also in Hessey's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 353.—*The Facts and Fallacies of the Sabbath Question, considered Scripturally, without reference to its Social, Political, or Sanitary Character*, by HENRY FULTON (2d ed., Dublin, 1856; 12mo, pp. 84: 3d ed., enlarged, Lond. 1858; 12mo, pp. 108). Mr Fulton agrees in the main with Archbishop Whately, but denies that the Christian Church is divinely authorised to ordain rites and ceremonies. He criticises publications of the Rev. Micaiah Hill, Dr Hugh M'Neile, the Right Hon. Joseph Napier, Professor Miller, and others.—*The Sabbath; its Origin, History, and Obligations; a Letter to the Rev. W. Sinclair, Incumbent of St George's, Leeds*, by JAMES PICKARD: 2d ed., with a Notice of the Rev. Mr Bolland's Reply (Leeds, 1856; 8vo, pp. 48). The name "James Pickard" is a pseudonyme.—*Time and Faith; an Inquiry into the Data of Ecclesiastical History* (Lond.

* See above, pp. 97, 98; and *Ency. Brit.* xix. 602, 8th ed.

1856; 2 vols. 8vo). Contents: 1. Weeks. 2. The Western Hemisphere. 3. Time. 4. The Sacerdotal Age. 5. The Mosaic Sabbath. 6. The Rabbinical Sabbath. 7. The Old Testament. 8. Hebrew Interpretation. 9. Zodiacal Mythology. 10. The Christian Era. 11. The New Testament. 12. Christian Antecedents. 13. The Kingdom of Heaven. 14. Transitional Judaism. 15. The Vespasian Era. 16. Antichrists. 17. Trajan, Hadrian, and the Antonines. 18. Gibbon. 19. Transitional Episcopacy. 20. The Third Century. 21. Constantine. The 1st, 5th, and 6th chapters are headed thus:—I. "A septenary division of time not universal. The month of the ancient Greeks divided into decades; the Roman month into calends, nones, and ides. Markets held every ninth day, called the *nundinae*. The hebdomadal week traced to Egypt and India. Names of the days of the week in the Sanscrit, Persian, and other dialects. Mystical meanings attached to the numbers seven, five, four, and three. Chinese divisions of the month,—periods of five, ten, and fifteen days." V. "Etymology of the word 'sabbath.' Correlative terms derived from the Hebrew Ab, 'a father.' Sab, the Egyptian Saturn, or father of the gods. Early scruples about the terms 'Sun-day, Moon-day,' &c. Star-worship condemned in the book of Job. Ancient religious festivals, a mitigation of the rigours of slavery. Primary meaning of the word translated 'holy' (kadosh), 'separate.' The 'holy' days of the Israelites holidays in a civil sense; often mentioned in connection with feasting, singing, and dancing. Simplicity of Mosaic forms of worship. Sabbath hours from sunset to sunset. Time of their commencement with modern Jews. Explanation of the penalty of death assigned to sabbath-breaking by the Mosaic law." VI. "Change in the national character of the Hebrews. Sketch of their history from the reign of Solomon to the Christian era. Synagogue worship not introduced till after the Babylonish captivity. Origin of the order of doctors of divinity, and of the custom of preaching from texts. Austerity of religious discipline produced by national calamities; re-action of opinion against ancient sabbath abuses. Tendency of all holiday customs towards licentiousness among the rude and ignorant. Necessity of watching their direction. Extreme views of Rabbinical sabbatarians. Their interpretation of the sabbath law rejected by Christ. The sabbath principle distinct from that of a fixed septenary form. The absolute sinfulness of work on a sabbath, not a doctrine recognised by Christians of all nations, nor by Mohammedans, &c. Physical impossibility of all keeping the same sabbath. Distinction drawn by Christ between the traditional and Divine in the Hebrew Scriptures. The same drawn by Josephus. Different versions of the Decalogue in Exodus and Deuteronomy. Laws engraved upon the tables of stone, afterwards copied and published with commentaries." In regard to the two reasons annexed to the Fourth Commandment in Exod. xx. 11, and Deut. v. 15 (above, p. 345), the author asks: "Which of these reasons appeared upon 'the tables of stone,' upon which the Commandments were

written? If Christ had been asked the question, he would probably have answered, 'neither:' he would perhaps have told us that they were both Rabbinical commentaries upon a law originally copied from the tables of stone, and that, as commentaries, and those of unknown writers, no other weight was to be assigned to them than that of pious intention" (vol. i. p. 114). As already mentioned (p. 359), the part of this treatise which relates to the Sabbath is reprinted from the Westminster Review. An abridgment of it has been published under the title of *History of Sunday* (Lond.: Groombridge and Sons, N. D.; 8vo, pp. 21).—*Two Letters to John Sperling, Esq., on the Lord's Day Question*, by the Rev. HENRY ALFORD [now D.D., and Dean of Canterbury] (Lond. 1856; 8vo). See also his edition of *The Greek Testament, with a Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, &c. (Lond. 1856–61, 4 vols. 8vo); notes on John xx. 26; Acts xx. 7; Rom. xiv. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2; Gal. iv. 10; Col. ii. 16; Heb. iv. 1–11; Rev. i. 10; and, as to the Jewish Sabbath, notes on Matt. xii. 6, 8; xxviii. 1; Mark ii. 27; Luke xiv. 1.; John v. 10, 11, 17. Commenting on Rom. xiv. 5, he says: "'One man (the weak) esteems (selects for honour, κρίνει ἀξίαν τιμῆς) one day above another day; another (the strong) esteems (ἀξίαν τιμῆς) every day. Let each be fully satisfied in his own mind.' It is an interesting question, what indication is here found of the observance or non-observance of a day of obligation in the apostolic times. The Apostle *decides nothing;* leaving *every man's own mind* to guide him in the point. He classes the observance or non-observance of particular days with the eating or abstaining from particular meats. In both cases he is concerned with things which he evidently treats as of *absolute indifference in themselves.* Now the question is, supposing the divine obligation of one day in seven to have been recognised by him *in any form*, could he have thus spoken? The obvious inference from his strain of arguing is that he *knew of no such obligation*, but believed *all times and days to be*, to the Christian strong in faith, ALIKE. I do not see how the passage can be otherwise understood. If any one day in the week were invested with the sacred character of the Sabbath, it would have been *wholly impossible* for the apostle to commend or uphold the man who judged all days worthy of equal honour, who as in verse 6 paid *no regard* to the (any) day. He must have visited him with his strongest disapprobation, as violating a command of God. *I therefore infer, that Sabbatical obligation to keep any day, whether seventh or first, was not recognised in apostolic times.* It must be carefully remembered, that this inference does not concern the question of the observance of *the Lord's-day* as *an institution of the Christian Church, analogous to* the ancient Sabbath, binding on us from considerations of *humanity* and *religious expediency*, and *by the rules of that branch of the Church in which Providence has placed us*, but not in any way inheriting the divinely-appointed obligation of the other, or the strict prohibitions by which its sanctity was defended. The reply commonly furnished to these considerations, viz., that the apostle was speak-

ing here only of *Jewish* festivals, and therefore cannot refer to Christian ones, is a quibble of the poorest kind; its assertors themselves distinctly maintaining the obligation of one such Jewish festival on Christians. What I maintain is, that had the apostle believed as they do, he could not by any possibility have written thus. Besides, in the face of *πᾶσαν ἡμέραν* ['every day'] the assertion is altogether unfounded." From the words of the apostle in Col. ii. 16, 17, he draws the same conclusion: "We may observe that if the ordinance of the Sabbath had been, *in any form*, of lasting obligation on the Christian Church, it would have been quite impossible for the apostle to have spoken thus. The fact of an obligatory rest of one day, whether the seventh or the first, would have been directly in the teeth of his assertion here: the holding of such would have been still to retain the shadow, while we possess the substance. And no answer can be given to this by the transparent special pleading, that he was speaking only of that which was *Jewish* in such observance: the whole argument being general, and the axiom of verse 17 universally applicable." * In a note on Rev. i. 10 (*ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ*), he observes that *ἐγενόμην* means not merely "*I was*," but "*I became*" in the spirit, "*i.e.*, in a state of spiritual ecstasy or trance, becoming thereby receptive of the vision or revelation to follow. That this is the meaning is distinctly shown by the same phrase occurring in ch. iv. 2: where after seeing the door open in heaven, and hearing the *ἀνάβα ὧδε*, he adds, *εὐθέως ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι* ['and immediately I was in the spirit']." By "the Lord's day" in ch. i. 10, Dr Alford understands "the first day of the week, kept by the Christian church as the weekly festival of the Lord's resurrection. On any probable hypothesis of the date of this book," he adds, "this is the earliest mention of the day by this name. This circumstance, coupled with an exegetical bias, has led certain modern interpreters, of whom, as far as I know, Wetstein was the first, to interpret the words of the day of *the Lord's coming*, *ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου*.† So Züllig, and in our own country, Drs S. R. Maitland and Todd." After amply refuting the notion of Maitland that there is nothing in the works of the ante-Nicene Fathers on which to ground the assumption that the weekly festival is meant, Dr Alford proceeds to express his astonishment how any even moderate Greek scholars can persuade themselves that the words *ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν* can mean "*I was transported by the Spirit* [or, *in spirit*] *into*," in the face of ch. iv. 2: and *κυριακὴ ἡμέρα*, "*the day of the Lord's coming*," in the face of the absence of a single precedent, and of the universal usage of the early church. "No such rendering," says he, "would ever have been thought of, nor would it now be worth even a passing mention, were it not that an apocalyptic system has been built upon it." —*The Christian Sunday not the Jewish Sabbath; Three Discourses*, by

* Dr Hessey disputes the soundness of this reasoning, in his *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 178, 427.

† See above, i. 105.

GEORGE DAWSON, M.A. (Lond. 1856; 8vo, pp. 37). An extract from one of these pithy discourses will be given below.—*Sermons preached at Trinity Chapel, Brighton*, by the late Rev. FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON; first series, 2d ed. (Lond. 1856, post 8vo). Sermon VI., preached Oct. 28, 1849, is on "The Shadow and the Substance of the Sabbath."—The same, second series, 2d. ed. (Lond. 1856). Sermon XIV., preached Nov. 14, 1852, is on "The Sydenham Palace, and the Religious Non-observance of the Sabbath." In the latter of these discourses Mr Robertson states his desire to be "to direct the minds of his congregation towards the formation of an opinion on the subject; not dogmatically, but humbly remembering always that his own temptation is from his very position, as a clergyman, to view such matters, not so much in the broad light of the possibilities of actual life, as with the eyes of a recluse; from a clerical and ecclesiastical, rather than from a large and human point of view. For no minister of Christ has a right to speak oracularly. All that he can pretend to do is to give his judgment, as one that has obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful. And on large national subjects there is perhaps no class so ill-qualified to form a judgment with breadth as we, the clergy of the Church of England, accustomed as we are to move in the narrow circle of those who listen to us with forbearance and deference, and mixing but little in real life, till in our cloistered and inviolable sanctuaries we are apt to forget that it is one thing to lay down rules for a religious clique, and another to legislate for a great nation." His opinion is, that "no one who would read St Paul's own writings with unprejudiced mind could fail to come to the conclusion that he considered the Sabbath abrogated by Christianity. Not merely modified in its stringency, but totally repealed." In Col. ii. 16, 17, Rom. xiv. 5, 6, and Gal. iv. 10, 11, the apostle "struck not at a day, but at a principle. Else, if with all this vehemence and earnestness, he only meant to establish a new set of days in the place of the old, there is no intelligible principle for which he is contending, and that earnest apostle is only a champion for one day instead of another—an assertor of the eternal sanctities of Sunday, instead of the eternal sanctities of Saturday. Incredible, indeed!" The utility of the Lord's-day is the ground on which the preacher rests the duty of its observance. "The need of the Sabbath is deeply hidden in human nature. He who can dispense with it must be holy and spiritual indeed. And he who still unholy and unspiritual, would yet dispense with it, is a man who would fain be wiser than his Maker. We, Christians as we are, still need the law: both in its restraints, and in its aids to our weakness. No man, therefore, who knows himself, but will gladly and joyfully use the institution. No man who knows the need of his brethren will wantonly desecrate it, or recklessly hurt even their scruples respecting its observance. And no such man can look with aught but grave and serious apprehensions on such an innovation upon English customs of life and thought, as the proposal to give public and official countenance to a scheme

which will *invite* millions, I do not say to an irreligious, but certainly an unreligious use of the day of rest. This, then, is the first modification of the broad view of a repealed Sabbath. Repealed though it be, there is such a thing as a religious observance of it. And provided that those who are stricter than we in their views of its obligation observe it not from superstition, nor in abridgment of Christian liberty, nor from moroseness, we are bound in Christian charity to yield them all respect and honour. Let them act out their conscientious convictions. Let not him that observeth not despise him that observeth.—The second modification of the broad view is, that there is such a thing as a *religious non-observance* of the Sabbath. I lay a stress on the word religious. For St Paul does not say that every non-observance of the Sabbath is religious, but that he who not observing it, observeth it not to the Lord, is, because acting on conscientious conviction, as acceptable as the others, who, in obedience to what they believe to be His will, observe it. He pays his non-observance to the Lord, who feeling that Christ has made him free, striving to live all his days in the spirit, and knowing that that which is displeasing to God, is not work nor recreation, but selfishness and worldliness, refuses to be bound by a Jewish ordinance which forbade labour and recreation, only with a typical intent. But he who, not trying to serve God on any day, gives Sunday to toil or pleasure, certainly observes not the day: but his non-observance is not rendered to the Lord. He may be free from superstition: but it is not Christ who has made him free. Nor is he one of whom St Paul would have said that his liberty on the Sabbath is as acceptable as his brother's conscientious scrupulosity. Here, then, we are at issue with the popular defence of public recreations on the Sabbath-day: not so much with respect to the practice, as with respect to the grounds on which the practice is approved. They claim liberty: but it is not Christian liberty. Like St Paul, they demand a license for non-observance; only, it is not 'non-observance to the Lord.' For distinguish well. The abolition of Judaism is not necessarily the establishment of Christianity: to do away with the Sabbath day in order to substitute a nobler, truer, more continuous Sabbath, even the Sabbath of all time given up to God, is well. But to do away the special Rights of God to the Sabbath, in order merely to substitute the Rights of Pleasure, or the Rights of Mammon, or even the license of profligacy and drunkenness, that, methinks, is not Paul's 'Christian liberty!'" On the other hand, he dissents from the views of those who would arrest, by petitions to the legislature on Sabbatarian grounds, the project of opening on Sunday such places of recreation as the Crystal Palace. "It is a return backwards to Judaism and Law;" and ultra-rigour of Sabbath observance, especially when it becomes coercive, brings a danger of injuring the conscience. "It was wisely taught by St Paul, that he who does anything with offence, *i.e.*, with a feeling that it is wrong, does wrong. To him it is wrong, even though it be not wrong abstractedly. Therefore it is always dangerous to multiply

restrictions and requirements beyond what is essential, because men feeling themselves hemmed in, break the artificial barrier, but breaking it with a sense of guilt, do thereby become hardened in conscience, and prepared for transgression against commandments which are Divine and of eternal obligation. Hence it is that the criminal has so often in his confessions traced his deterioration in crime to the first step of breaking the Sabbath day: and no doubt with accurate truth. But what shall we infer from this? Shall we infer, as is so often done upon the platform and in religious books, that it proves the everlasting obligation of the Sabbath? Or shall we, with a far truer philosophy of the human soul, infer, in the language of, St Peter, that we have been laying on him 'a yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear?' —in the language of St Paul, that 'the motions of sin were by the law,' that the rigorous rule was itself the stimulating, moving cause of the sin; and that when the young man, worn out with his week's toil, first stole out into the fields to taste the fresh breath of a spring day, he did it with a vague, secret sense of transgression, and that having as it were drawn his sword in defiance against the established code of the religious world, he felt that from thenceforward there was for him no return, and so he became an outcast, his sword against every man, and every man's sword against him? I believe this to be the true account of the matter: and believing it, I cannot but believe that the false, Jewish notions of the Sabbath day which are prevalent have been exceedingly pernicious to the morals of the country." To some of Mr Robertson's views Dr Hessey objects in his *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 191, 429, 433; but in p. 496 quotes him with approval as to the necessity of Sunday recreation to labouring men.—*The National Sunday League Record, established to promote the opening of the British Museum, National Gallery, Crystal Palace, and similar Institutions, on Sunday afternoon;* edited by WILLIAM DUTHIE (London: published at the Office of the League, 4 Beaufort Buildings, Strand, 1856–59; 1 vol. royal 8vo, pp. 400). As to the National Sunday League, see above, p. 813. Many publications on the anti-Puritan side are sold by it.—*Modes of Sabbath Observance left to the Decision of the Individual Conscience; a Sermon preached at the Unitarian Chapel, Newbury, Feb.* 10, 1856, by the Rev. F. R. YOUNG (2d ed., Lond. 1856; 8vo, pp. 16).—*The Sunday Question; being a Review of the "Leicester Prize Essays on Sunday Amusements"* (Leicester, 1857; 12mo, pp. 24). These Prize Essays, by John Brooks, Joseph Needham, Samuel Foxon, and Elizabeth Needham, were published at Leicester in the same year.—*Christianity without Judaism; a Second Series of Essays, including the Substance of Sermons delivered in London and other places*, by the Rev. BADEN POWELL (Lond. 1857; post 8vo, pp. 263). Quoted above, p. 259; and noticed in the *British Quarterly Review* for April 1858. This valuable treatise is partly a reprint of the articles in Kitto's *Journal*, mentioned above, p. 356. The sermons of which it includes the substance were published in 1856 by the National

Sunday League, as a pamphlet with the same title, *Christianity without Judaism*. The volume contains: I. General Statement of the Subject. II. On the Application and Misapplication of Scripture in general. III. The Law and the Gospel: 1. The Primeval Dispensations; 2. The Judaical Law; 3. The Ministry of Christ; 4. The Teaching of the Apostles; 5. Views of the Law and the Gospel held in the early Christian Church; 6. Later Views; 7. General View of the State of the Question at the present day; 8. On the Use of the Old Testament by Christians; 9. On the Inspiration of Scripture; 10. Appendix containing extracts and documents referred to, and a Note on Hugh Miller's "Testimony of the Rocks."—*Sabbatism: A Heresy of the Modern Christian Church; inconsistent with the Genius of Christianity, opposed to the teaching of Jesus Christ, unwarranted by the example of the Apostles, condemned by St Paul, and not to be found in the writings of the early Fathers, or the customs of the Primitive Church: Being a Reply to a Sermon preached by the Rev. Robert Maguire, Incumbent of Clerkenwell*, by J. BAXTER LANGLEY (Lond. 1857).—"*The Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath;*" and "*Three Ways of Spending Sunday:*" *Two Addresses delivered in Rochdale, Feb.* 1857; *with a Preface to the Religious Public;* by HENRY W. PARKINSON, Nonconformist Minister (Rochdale, 1857; 8vo, pp. 24).—*The People's Sunday: a Lay Sermon in opposition to the Superstitious Heresy of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London and Winchester, and other Clergymen, who have denounced the Sunday Opening of the Crystal Palace;* by HENRY J. SLACK, F.G.S., Barrister at Law (Lond. 1858; 12mo, pp. 21).—*Discontinuance by Act of Parliament of the Ten Commandments in the Church Service* (Lond. 1859; 8vo, pp. 16).—*Bones for the Sabbatarians to pick, Texts for Inquirers to chew, Nuts for Mr Woodman to crack; in an Appeal from the Prejudices to the Judgments of the thinking Inhabitants of Pembrokeshire on the Sabbath Question*, by B. S. NAYLER (Haverfordwest, 1859; 4to, pp. 64). An acute, lively, caustic, yet genial discussion, conducted in a somewhat eccentric style. The writer argues strenuously for the objects of the National Sunday League. Comparing the effects of British and Continental Sunday-observance he says: "I have spent upwards of twenty-eight years on the Continent of Europe; yet, while there, I never saw such sights, never heard any reports of such Sabbath-breaking, drunkenness, and debauchery, as I have witnessed at home—such as I can read every week in the police reports, published in this boastedly civilised, enlightened Christian country of ours" (p. 40). But not to set up his own knowledge of the keeping of Sunday on the Continent in opposition to the notions of men who have never been there, he quotes, in confirmation of his statement, Bishop Copleston, Dr Thomas Guthrie, Mr Duthie, Mr Brough, and the Vienna correspondent of the *Times*. The following is a characteristic passage: "Safely encased in his pulpit, Mr Woodman may tell his congregation—'It is a remarkable fact, that our Lord ever discriminated most distinctly between the *Moral* Law and the *Ceremonial* Law of the

Jews.' Just observe his style. He does not say simply, that our Lord *discriminated*, but, that he *ever* discriminated; not that he discriminated *distinctly* merely, but *most* distinctly—EVER DISCRIMINATED MOST DISTINCTLY! and yet, despite this doubly emphatic style, it will puzzle him to find a single text to support his imposingly expressed assertion. Nor does he stop here; he goes a-head, regardless of discretion and truth, adding—'When He came to *the Moral Law*—the law of the Ten Commandments—the law of which the Sabbath is a part—He, by teaching the *most explicit*, and words the *most emphatic*, pronounced that law to be an *eternal* law—*ever* in force—*world-wide* in its obligations, and *always holy*'! No fewer than FIVE swaggering assertions, not one of which is *true!* all of them *false!* I demand chapter and verse. I stand pledged to the public to vindicate Truth against the assaults of Error; and I now charge my self-constituted opponent (the voluntary champion of Sabbatism) with *misrepresenting* the Scriptures—which, if not done in sheer ignorance, may Heaven pardon his guilt!"—*The Lord's Day* NOT *the Sabbath: a Sermon preached in Holywood Church*, August 10, 1856, by CHARLES PARSONS REICHEL, D.D., late Donellan Lecturer in the University of Dublin (Dublin, 1859; 8vo, pp. 46). In his preface Dr Reichel says: "I have been accused of wishing to do away with all observance of the Lord's-day, because I have argued that the Lord's-day of Christians is not the Sabbath of the Jews. It is partly to vindicate myself from this monstrous misconception of my meaning—in so far, at least, as it it is not wilful—that I now print, nearly verbatim, a Discourse preached so long ago as 1856. But the vindication of my views from misconception and misrepresentation is a trifling object in comparison with the setting forth of important truth. Of course, I can claim no originality whatsoever in my views, and but little in the arguments by which I support them. My views are those held unquestioned in the early Church, before Romish corruptions were introduced: those held by the great Reformers in England and on the Continent: those held by the greatest names in the English Church, from the Reformation to our own times. But what is more: the principle involved in these views is the very same which St Paul discussed and settled in the Epistle to the Galatians: the great principle that CHRISTIANS ARE NOT BOUND BY THE CEREMONIAL LAW. Let us by all means observe 'the Lord's-day' (as St John calls it) as a day of rest from task-work of all kinds, mental as well as bodily. But do not let us call it the Sabbath (a name never given to it in the New Testament*); do not let us appeal to the Fourth Commandment on its behalf; because thus 'we tempt God,' in the language of St Peter, 'by putting on the neck of the disciples a yoke, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear.' (Acts xv. 10.) For if we

* "This is admitted even by the Assembly's Catechism, which says, that '*in the New Testament the Christian Sabbath is called the Lord's-day.*'"

introduce one part of the ceremonial law, the whole must come in along with it. And that the Sabbath-commandment is a part of the ceremonial law, will, I think be evident to all who carefully and dispassionately consider the reasoning of the following Discourse." Dr Reichel agrees with Mr Robertson of Brighton (above, p. 377–8), as to the tendency of Sabbatarian laws, so stringent that they cannot be obeyed, to harden the conscience and lead to crime. As to the supposed danger of teaching the people that they are not bound by the Fourth Commandment, he is persuaded that the teaching of truth can never ultimately do mischief, and that it is the business of God's ministers simply to set forth God's truth, without fear of the consequences. To be afraid of doing so arises, in his opinion, not from piety, but from want of faith. "And," he proceeds, "the benefit of a day of real rest from toil and care is so obvious and so great, that common sense, to say nothing of apostolic example and the perpetual practice of the Christian Church, will be abundantly sufficient to secure it. But this reasoning applies only to a day of *rest:* not to a day of severe religious task-work. Neither common sense nor apostolic practice sanction the latter. 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty' (2 Cor. iii. 17). 'Only use not your liberty as a cloak of licentiousness' (1 Peter ii. 16). These texts are the quintessence of what ought to be our teaching on the due observance of the Lord's-day. It is a day to be kept, not on the ground of a rigid and inflexible enactment, but on the ground of a free and willing heart. It is a day not to be devoted, like the Mosaic Sabbath, to mere bodily inaction, nor yet to be spent, like the Sabbath of the Assembly's Shorter Catechism, in a round of 'exercises' which would leave both body and mind perfectly exhausted at its close,—such a Sabbath violates the very meaning of the word, for it is not *rest*, but *toil* of the severest kind,—it is a day so to be spent as shall most effectively rest and refresh both body and mind after the necessary labours of the week; a day of thankful commemoration, and of such innocent recreation as shall harmonise with a devout and joyful spirit. A day to be spent, not in watching lest we should transgress a stern prohibition of bodily, or a still sterner injunction of mental, toil, but in the blessed consciousness that 'in Christ all things are ours.' A day not to be marked by 'the sad countenance' of the hypocrite, who makes his own will-worship, his abstinence from what is lawful and right, or even his arbitrary conventionalisms of observance, into a source of self-complacent censoriousness, but to be signalised by the cheerful look which befits 'the redeemed of the Lord.' A day to be devoted not to the bitter service of a task-master, who has the right, if he choose, to curtail our enjoyments, and to prohibit, in his arbitrary pleasure, what is in itself innocent, but to the worship of a Father who requires our hearts, not our austerities, in return for His unspeakable love. A day, in short, to be observed in the spirit of the Gospel, not in the letter of the Law." In a note to this passage he observes: "The assertion that the

Mosaic Sabbath was simply a day of bodily inaction, will, doubtless, surprise many of my readers. We have got so accustomed to connect the words 'keep holy,' 'sanctify,' with ideas of religious worship, and of meeting together for that purpose, that we are in danger of forgetting that their proper sense is merely 'to set apart to God.' And this was done, according to the Fourth Commandment, by refraining from all 'servile work' upon the Sabbath. Only at the tabernacle, or subsequently at the temple, was the Sabbath distinguished by any peculiar religious solemnity. What this was we find described in Numbers xxviii. 9, and Levit. xxiii. 8. The daily sacrifice was doubled, and 'a holy convocation' took place on the Sabbath. But it must be recollected that this prescribed worship could only take place at the tabernacle or the temple. To sacrifice anywhere else was forbidden; and the 'holy convocation' was for the purpose of assisting at the sacrifice. *Except at the Tabernacle or the Temple, therefore, no religious solemnity distinguished the Sabbath, according to the law of Moses.* It is true that, in the New Testament, we find the Synagogue worship organised upon the Sabbath day. But this did not arise until after the captivity." These passages are from Dr Reichel's preface. In the sermon itself he argues in the following effective manner: "To say, as is often now said, that the apostles transferred the Sabbath from the last day of the week to the first, is to charge them with *doing* what was, in fact, utterly impossible. For the Sabbath *could not* have been transferred from the last day of the week to the first *before* the destruction of Jerusalem; for you must recollect that the seventh day Sabbath was not merely the law of God, but the law of the land throughout Judea until the destruction of Jerusalem, *i. e.*, long after the book of Acts and all the epistles of St Paul were written. The Jewish Christians were therefore obliged to keep the Sabbath day, and to keep it on the seventh day of the week, just as they were obliged to keep up all the rest of the observances of the Mosaic ritual. And what they were obliged to do in Judea, we know they also practised out of Judea. So long as the Temple continued undestroyed, so long, that is to say, as God had not made impossible the strict observance of the Mosaic ritual, so long did all the Jewish Christians, in common with the great Apostle of the Gentiles, keep up the observance of the whole of that ritual.* . . . Yet we find that when the disciples met for Christian purposes, it was from the very earliest time on the *first* day of the week.† . . . And if we ask why the first day of the week was thus fixed on from the earliest times as the appropriate day for acts of Christian worship and Christian fellowship, we find an answer to this question in the title which it bears in the Apocalypse. It was the Lord's-day, (Rev. i. 10), the day on which Christ rose from the dead,

* Dr Reichel here refers to Acts xviii. 18, and xxi. 20, &c.; to which he might have added Paul's solemn declarations in Acts xxv. 8, xxviii. 17, and Philip. iii. 6.

† Acts xx. 7, and 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, are referred to.

thereby proving Himself to be indeed the Lord—which was most naturally fixed on as the proper day for meeting in the name of Christ, and worshipping Him as their Lord and God. . . . Up to the destruction of Jerusalem, then, the Lord's-day and the Sabbath were perfectly distinct; just as distinct as baptism and circumcision: the one for Christians, whether they were Jews or not; the other for Jews alone, whether they were Christians or not. I beg you to mark this and retain it in your minds, because it will serve to keep you clear throughout the subsequent investigation. Christians, whether Jews or Gentiles, throughout the world, observed the *first* day of the week, *as Christians*, in commemoration of Christ's resurrection: the Christian Jews observed also the *last* day of the week *as Jews*, because it was commanded in the Jewish law. Up to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, then, no transference of the Sabbath to the first day of the week *could* have taken place. But did it *then* take place? This question is in fact the same as the question, Did the Gentile Christians observe the Lord's-day on different grounds *before* the destruction of Jerusalem from those on which they observed it *afterwards?* If the Sabbath was at that epoch transferred from the last day to the first, it is quite plain they did. In that case, after having observed the first day, previously, simply in commemoration of their Saviour's resurrection, they must have then come to observe it also, or indeed chiefly, because God commanded His ancient people to observe the last day as a Sabbath! In other words, the advocates of the supposition that the Sabbath was, at the destruction of Jerusalem, transferred from the last to the first day of the week, if they look their own theory in the face, and do not shrink from what it necessarily implies, must hold that the Sabbath was not binding on the Gentiles for the first thirty years after the death of Christ, but then suddenly became binding on them! —It will not surprise you, after this exhibition of what is involved in the notion of a transference of the Sabbath; that no early Christian writer says one word about such transference, and of course that no portion of the early Church entertained any such notion. The idea that the Lord's-day is to be observed on the first day of the week, because God commanded the Jews to observe the seventh day as a Sabbath, seems to have arisen in the middle ages, along with the other corruptions of the Church of Rome. And it is not a little remarkable that among Protestants of our days, who exclaim against Romish corruptions, there should be found numbers to adopt a corruption so extraordinary as this; a corruption which alters the law of God while pretending to observe it, there being no vestige of any such alteration in the New Testament, nay, it being actually impossible that such an alteration could have been made during the Apostles' times.* Dr Reichel appends to his Sermon three Notes, 1. On the supposed transference of the Sab-

* That Sabbatarianism really is what Dr Reichel here asserts it to be, a corruption of the Church of Rome, is abundantly proved by Dr

bath from one day to another; 2. On the Decalogue; and, 3. On St Paul's doctrine upon Sabbath observance. In the second he concludes that "the evils that have arisen from the exaggerated view generally taken of the Decalogue [as a supposed summary of the moral law], and which have been sanctioned by unreflecting reverence and unquestioned custom, may teach us how dangerous it is to yield to the temptation of giving a reason which is not true, but which the person to whom it is addressed will fancy to be true. Appeals to the Sabbath-command of the Decalogue in favour of the observance of the Lord's-day, *and of all church festivals*, were originally made in the middle ages by Romish divines, who knew that those whom they wished to influence were too ignorant to draw the distinction between the moral and the ceremonial parts of the Decalogue, and could not therefore detect the fallacy of these appeals. This habit of appealing to the Decalogue in its turn countenanced the idea that it was a summary of the moral law: and this being once assumed as an unquestionable fact, "Sabbath observance," in spite of its evidently ceremonial nature, was boldly asserted to be a part of the moral law! Thus arose a perfect confusion of mind on the subject of the nature of a moral as distinguished from a ceremonial precept; an evil so great that it may be seriously questioned whether it do not more than counterbalance the advantage of reciting the Decalogue in the Communion Service; and whether it would not have been wiser to introduce into the service instead of the Decalogue 'the two great commandments' from which the Decalogue itself is derived, as was actually proposed at the Revolution of 1688." The publication of this bold and vigorous pamphlet occasioned an extraordinary commotion among the "Evangelical" party in the North of Ireland, where its learned author resides as Professor of Latin in Queen's College, Belfast. It was answered by several ministers belonging to different denominations, whose publications are mentioned above, p. 346.—*The Decalogue viewed as the Christian's Law, with Special Reference to the Questions and Wants of the Times*; by RICHARD TUDOR, B.A., Curate of Helstone (Camb. 1860; cr. 8vo, pp. 596). Lectures VIII. and IX. are entitled, "The Jewish Sabbath the Rest of a Day," and "The Christian Sabbath the Rest in the Lord." In the former, Mr Tudor gives a clear and ample statement of the reasons which compel him to reject the doctrine of a primeval Sabbath. In the latter, he discards the Sabbath wholly; but, as usual, is led into perplexities and inconsistencies by holding the Fourth Commandment to be in some sense a law to Christians. He is however decidedly of opinion that the Lord's-

Hessey in the third of his *Bampton Lectures*. He acknowledges in the preface to the volume his obligation to Mr Dyce, R.A., for the perusal of an unpublished paper upon *The Ecclesiastical Sabbatarianism of the Church of Rome, anterior to the Reformation*, which, he states, "afforded him a valuable clew to one of the most difficult portions of the subject."

day is not the Sabbath transferred from the Jewish Saturday to the Christian Sunday, but an institution which must be ascribed to the Apostles for this among other reasons, that "unless they had bound the Church with the Lord's-day, he cannot conceive it possible that every Christian community, from the very first, would have observed it" (p. 329). For the facts thus assumed, the only Scriptural evidence adduced by him is Acts xx. 7, and Rev. i. 10; while his quotations from some of the Fathers (loosely and inaccurately made) are utterly inadequate to supplement the texts referred to. In truth, we *do not know* either that *every* Christian community observed the Lord's-day before Constantine's time, or that the practice of holding meetings on it was followed by any *from the very first*. But granting these suppositions, can no other account be given of the facts than that proposed by Mr Tudor? I venture to say that another and a perfectly natural account *can* be given, and that an Apostolic ordinance—though, on the supposition made, there certainly *might* be one—is by no means indispensable for the explanation of the facts assumed. The theory I would humbly suggest is analogous to that already proposed (above, p. 181) to account for Paul's naming the first day of the week to the Christians of Galatia and Corinth, as a fit time for laying aside alms on behalf of their starving brethren at Jerusalem. Till the admission of Cornelius into the Church by Peter, A.D. 41, all the converts were Jews or circumcised proselytes; and during the next four years the only Gentiles admitted were those who, like this devout centurion and other so-called "proselytes of the gate," had renounced idolatry, and, it would seem, engaged to obey the seven precepts which are traditionally said to have been given to Noah. (See above, p. 204.) It was not till the year 45 that Paul went on a mission to the *idolatrous* Gentiles, a proceeding which not only roused his unconverted countrymen to madness against him, but was so generally displeasing even to the Christian Jews, that for a considerable time the converts from idolatry, received into Christian communities, must have been comparatively few.* Now, all the Jewish Christians (including the converts from among their circumcised proselytes, usually called proselytes of righteousness), continued to observe the Sabbath precisely as they had done before being converted; and when it ended at sunset on Saturday, they had still several hours of leisure till the time of retiring to sleep. What so natural, then, as that the members of this despised and persecuted sect should take the weekly opportunity, after leaving their respective synagogues, of supping together, and giving each other that support and encouragement

* As errors are often committed through oversight of the distinction between the different classes of converts, I refer for a clear exposition of the matter to Bishop Hinds's *Rise and Early Progress of Christianity*, Part II., chapters 2, 3, and 4 (*Ency. Metrop.*, Griffin's ed., Lond. 1850). See also Neander's *Hist. of the Planting of the Church*, Books I., II., and III.; and Baden Powell's *Christianity without Judaism*.

which congregated numbers are so well fitted to afford—in short, of partaking in common of love-feasts and the Eucharist? Nay, is it not likely that even before his crucifixion our Lord frequently met his disciples at this convenient season, in order to sup with and instruct them? Here, then, might be the beginning of a custom which in the space from A.D. 33 to A.D. 41 had ample time to become established, and to which, first the converted "devout Gentiles," and next the converted idolators, would naturally conform when received into Churches where they found it existing. The notion would soon occur even to the Jewish Christians, that the first day of the week deserved above all others to be thus signalised; and they would readily concur with their Gentile brethren in setting apart (if the early Churches *did* set apart) *a whole day*, ending at sunset on Sunday, in honour of their Lord's resurrection. The Gentiles probably took the lead in *this;* for, seeing the Jews abstain from work on the seventh day, and spend a portion of it in their synagogues, they would naturally wish to hold similar meetings for *Christian* worship and instruction. The forms adopted by the Christian Church were accordingly, as is well known, those of the Jewish synagogue. Thus may the supposed early and universal custom of holding assemblies on Sunday be completely accounted for.* That the following of any such custom by the Apostles in common with the other members of the Church, was either equivalent to an *ordinance* by them, enjoining the sanctification of the first day of the week as the Sabbath or as a prayer-day, or sufficient to stamp with divine authority any subsequent ordinance of the Church for its observance, is by no means universally admitted.—*The Whole Doctrine of Calvin about the Sabbath and the Lord's Day; extracted from his Commentaries, Catechism, and Institutes of the Christian Religion, by* ROBERT COX, F.S.A. Scot.: *with an Appendix, containing the opinions of Luther, Melancthon, Zuinglius, Beza, Cranmer, and Knox* (Edin. 1860; 8vo, pp. 92). Here is collected all that Calvin has written about the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, from the English version of his Works, printed by the Calvin Translation Society.—*Sunday: Its Origin, History, and present Obligation, considered in Eight Lectures, preached before the University of Oxford in the year* 1860, *on the Foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, canon of Salisbury,* by JAMES AUGUSTUS HESSEY, D.C.L., Head Master of Merchant Taylors' School, Preacher to the Honourable Society of Gray's Inn; sometime Fellow of St John's College, and Select Preacher in the University (Lond. 1860; 8vo, pp. 504; 2d ed., with a copious index, 1861). Whether regarded historically or theologically, this is a work of great value, being the fruit of extensive and careful research by an accomplished

* The explanation above proposed appears to supply the defects of all previous theories that I am acquainted with—such as those stated by Neander, *Hist. of the Planting of the Church*, p. 159 (Bohn's ed.) Domville, i. 332; Hengstenberg, p. 47; and Hessey, p. 210. The views of the first three writers are considered in *Sabbath Laws*, pp. 536-9.

scholar, who thinks with discrimination, reasons acutely, writes in a clear and manly style, and treats the subject with good sense and much knowledge of mankind. There are eight Lectures, bearing the following titles:—1. General statement of the Sabbath and Lord's-day question. 2. The history of the Lord's-day to the end of the third century. 3. Its history to the end of the fifth century, and the growth of ecclesiastical Sabbatarianism in the Church of Rome. 4. History of the Sabbath to our Lord's resurrection. 5. What the Sabbath is since our Lord's resurrection. 6. The Lord's-day on the Continent since the Reformation. 7. The Lord's-day in England since the Reformation. 8. The Lord's-day viewed practically. Dr Hessey states that he was induced to treat of the Lord's-day in such a place and before such an assembly, by the belief "that great confusion of thought exists on this deeply important subject, and that the institution in question, though sufficiently venerable in itself, has been regarded as identical with, instead of at the most analogous to, one of greater antiquity indeed, but of more limited application, the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. I believe that from this confusion have arisen not merely misapprehensions of a speculative nature, but errors affecting practice, and productive of misunderstandings among brethren. I see that the result has been, on the part of the more learned Clergy, an avoidance of a topic which they cannot treat of logically and historically without being exposed to obloquy, and which they cannot treat of popularly without apologising to their self-respect and sense of duty: on the part of the better informed Laity, a distaste for a doctrine, which, treated (as it generally is) illogically and with want of historical precision, they condemn together with its advocates, and dismiss summarily, either as a clumsy artifice or as a burthen too heavy to be borne. But I see, further, that this was not always so; that there was a time when Κυριακὴ and Σάββατον [*Lord's-day* and *Sabbath*] respectively had their meanings accurately and sharply defined. Hence I venture to hope that an attempt to re-state those meanings, and to clear up certain difficulties connected with them, may not be altogether in vain. I will only make two requests; the first, that the liberty of candid inquiry, so readily allowed in other matters, may be as readily allowed here; the second, that my audience will carefully discriminate between two things, which, though essentially distinct, are often confounded in popular nomenclature, a respectful desire to set an institution on its true basis, and a disrespectful desire to undermine it." (Pp. 3–5, 1st ed.) He classifies the holders of opinions concerning the Lord's-day into, 1. Those who admit of no distinction of days, and recognise no Sabbath but that so often spoken of by the Fathers—namely, the Christian's rest on every day from evil works here, to be followed by the better Sabbath in heaven hereafter; 2. The Seventh-day Baptists, who observe Saturday as the Sabbath appointed at the Creation and enjoined in the Fourth Commandment to be kept by all men for ever (see above, i. 157, and other places referred to in the index under

the head "Seventh-day Baptists"); 3. Those holding the Puritan view propounded in the Westminster Confession and Catechisms (i. 231–4); 4. Those holding the milder but perplexing Sabbatarianism of Sharp, Secker, Horsley, Mant, Stopford, and others (ii. 141, 213, 325, 336, 339); 5. Those who regard the Sabbath as a purely Jewish institution now abolished, and the Lord's-day as an institution for which no other than an Ecclesiastical origin can be found (such are White, Heylin, Sanderson, Taylor, Morer, and Whately, i. 166, 173, 184; ii. 10, 119, 333); and, 6. Archbishop Bramhall (i. 203) and others, whose notions agree in the main with the purely Ecclesiastical view, but invest the Sunday with a more imposing origin than it does, "or rather bestow upon the word 'Ecclesiastical' itself a deeper significance. 'What was the authority by which this change was made? 'If it was not made by our Lord's authority, which there is no cause to doubt, at least it was made by that of the apostles. It is undeniable that the Lord's Day is an apostolical tradition, and it is not so clear that there is no precept for the change in Holy Scripture. As for the manner of observing the Lord's Day, we obtain a guidance for this, not in set terms, but from considerations of the law of nature, and of the evangelical law, and also from the positive law of the old Sabbath; not by force of its terms or by preceptive obligation, but by its being explanatory of the law of nature.' Thus writes Archbishop Bramhall—and to the extent of holding 'the assembling upon the first day of the week for the purposes of public worship and religious instruction to be a law of Christianity of Divine appointment,' Archdeacon Paley supports him [above, ii. 257]. Bishop Prideaux and Bishop Cosin [above, i. 164, and Supp. to the same vol.] had anticipated him, and avoided that confusion between change and superseding into which he fell. But the venerable author of *The Saint's Rest*, I mean Richard Baxter (though he also is partially Sabbatarian, and indeed holds that the Sabbath was communicated to Adam), is perhaps the clearest expositor of the main points of this view" [above, ii. 28].* This enumeration Dr Hessey does not present as an exhaustive one, such authors being purposely omitted as embrace in their systems features belonging to very different schools —Hooker, for instance, and Bishop Stillingfleet (above, i. 141; ii. 6); "but on the whole," says he, "so far as I have been able to classify them, these are the leading opinions upon the relation of Sunday to the Sabbath, which have struggled for mastery in England since the Reformation to the present hour. They have caused and are causing great contention, partly indeed by the principles supposed to be involved in them, but more, perhaps (such is the practical character of the English people), by the results to which one class of them leads, and to which the other

* Dr Hessey gives a summary of the opinions of these five classes of thinkers, which I have omitted, partly for want of room, but chiefly because it seems enough to refer as I have done to what is already stated pretty fully in the present work.

is supposed to have a tendency to lead. I say 'one' and 'the other,' for we may reduce the six to two. The no Sabbath or perpetual Sabbath opinion, and that which advocates the Saturday Sabbath, may be omitted from our estimate altogether; they are rarely to be found now, at least in a substantive shape, though the former of them has reappeared as an excrescence of the purely Ecclesiastical view. Of the remainder, the third and fourth may be called—I do not use the word in an invidious sense—the Sabbatarian, and the fifth and sixth the Dominical set of opinions. . . . Which of these two antagonistic opinions has greater reason on its side—whether either of them is entirely free from objection or to be admitted without qualification—whether they have any, and if so, what elements in common, I now invite you to inquire, not indeed directly, but indirectly, by examination, that is, into the origin, history, and present obligation of that Holy Day which we have every interest in honouring, but which is very likely to be dishonoured, if advocated on grounds inconsistent with Scripture, and with the facts of the world without and within. We live in an age in which the titles, so to speak, of our ordinances are examined into with the most exact and juridical strictness. Men, rightly or wrongly, (for my own part I believe rightly), demand that no weaker evidence should be given of the right of the Lord's-day to succeed, in whatever degree, to the honours of the Sabbath, than of the right of a family to possess the temporal honours or the estates of a family which has preceded it. And, let me add, if they find it laying claim to a sanction which cannot be satisfactorily substantiated, they are inclined to look incredulously upon, or not to examine at all, the sanctions which it really possesses." Dr Hessey then proceeds to state the positions maintained in his subsequent Lectures, the chief of which are these:—

"[1.] That the Lord's-day (a festival on the first day in each week in memory of our Lord's resurrection) is of Divine institution and peculiarly Christian in its character, as being indicated in the New Testament, and having been acknowledged and observed by the apostles and their immediate followers as distinct from the Sabbath (or Jewish festival on the seventh day in each week), the obligation to observe which is denied, both expressly and by implication, in the New Testament. [2.] That in the two centuries after the death of St John the Lord's-day was never confounded with the Sabbath, but carefully distinguished from it, as an institution under the law of liberty, as observed on a different day and with different feelings; and moreover, that, as a matter of fact, it was exempt from the severity of the provisions which had been the characteristic of the Sabbath in theory, or in practice, or in both. [3.] That after the first three centuries, a new era in the history of the Lord's-day commenced; tendencies towards Sabbatarianism, or confusion of the Christian with the Jewish institution, beginning to manifest themselves. These, however, were slight, until the end of the fifth century, and are traceable chiefly to and in the civil legislation of the period.

Afterwards they developed themselves more decidedly; Sabbatarianism became at length systematised, in one of its phases, in the ante-Reformation Church both in England and on the Continent by the later Schoolmen, probably in their desire to lay down exact rules for consciences, and under a fancied necessity of urging the precedent of Jewish enactments in support of Christian holy-days. [4.] That Sabbatarianism, of every phase, was expressly repudiated by the chief reformers of almost every country (even by Calvin, the friend of Knox, and by Knox himself, who is supposed, though incorrectly, to have introduced it into Scotland), and in particular that it does not appear in the fully authorised documents of the Church of England. . . . [9.] That the position that the Fourth Commandment is binding in the very letter, and is *par excellence* the ground for the observance of our weekly festival, proves too much, for it would drive us either to the observance of Saturday (as the advanced and more consistent Sabbatarians urged), or, at the very least, to a Judaic observance of the Lord's-day. [10.] That Sabbatarianism, the strange varieties of which really demand serious notice, is a return not merely to Judaism but to theoretic Romanism. [11.] That the mention of God's rest after the Creation in the Fourth Commandment, and the introduction of the word 'Remember,' do not *prove* that the Patriarchs observed or even knew of a Sabbath before Moses used the words, 'To-morrow is *a* Sabbath,' &c. [12.] That this assertion is quite compatible with the existence of an hebdomadal division of time anterior to the days of Moses. [13.] That it is strengthened by the fact that the heathen were never reproached with the non-observance of the Sabbath, which we may presume they would have been, had the obligation to observe it been a moral one, *i.e.*, a matter of natural law. . . . [20.] That though the Sabbath, as an ordinance, has passed away, and though neither apostles nor early writers allude to it or to the Fourth Commandment as a precedent or as the ground for observing the Lord's-day, we may conceive the analogy of them to have been among the reasons which determined the proportion of time which should be the Lord's. [21.] That the same analogy may direct us, though in a much fainter degree, because of the different characters of the two dispensations, to the employments and enjoyments suitable or not unsuitable to the Lord's-day. [22.] That on the Sabbath itself there appears to have been a greater liberty of employment and enjoyment than is generally supposed; and that our Lord, so far as He dealt with it, concerned Himself, not with proving that it was about to expire (this it was to do, of course, when the ceremonial and political laws generally were to expire), but in purifying it from superstitions, in making it practically useful so long as it should last, and in redeeming it from the charge of enjoining absolute inactivity. [23.] That still, though the Lord's-day is not to be Judaic in the way of over-strictness, it is not to be Judaic (in the sense in which the later Jews were often reproached by the Fathers for the use of their Sabbaths) in the way of license;

i.e. it is not to be a mere gala-day, as on the Continent with the Romanists, and, to a great extent, even with the Protestant and Reformed Communions. . . . [26.] That the civil power should interfere as little as possible with the observance of the Lord's-day, but that, a due regard being had to the compound nature of man, it may fairly prohibit on that day what offers men profound temptations to forget their souls or to wear out their bodies. Yet that, even here, care should be taken that there be not one law for the rich and another for the poor. That the subject of prohibitions should be approached both by legislators and by clergy, as practical men (so the preacher approaches it, having lived in a great city for years), and with a due consideration for the different circumstances of town and country, and for the exigencies of society. . . . [28.] That care should be taken not to impose burthen's upon men's consciences which are too heavy to be borne, or to make that a matter of right and wrong which is really a matter of expediency. And this on two principles: 1st, that to break a merely supposed obligation while it is supposed to be a real one, has a weakening effect upon the character; 2d, that an advocacy of what is right on insufficient grounds is sooner or later exposed and called a pious fraud, and produces disgust of all pious injunctions, whether frauds or no. [29.] That such an injunction as the following, if used by those who are not absolutely satisfied of the soundness of the Sabbatarian ground, is (for truth can do no harm) a very faithless and timorous policy: 'Do not loosen men's adherence to the Fourth Commandment, lest they neglect the Lord's-day altogether.' . . . [32.] That in reference to such social questions as whether places of mere amusement or of secular instruction should be opened, or travelling permitted at all, or if at all in what degree, and the like, on the Lord's-day, principles should rather be sought for than exact rules. [33.] That, on the whole, the Lord's-day, being an institution so Divine and especially Christian, so commended to us by prescription and universal adoption, even from the apostles' time, so wonderfully preserved to us through many vicissitudes, so founded on moral obligation, so recommended to us by the analogy of the Jewish polity, so adapted *a priori* to the whole nature of man, so recommended *a posteriori* by the advantages which many ages have enjoyed under it, should be jealously guarded from vitiation, should not be made a yoke of bondage on the one hand, or a cloak for licentiousness on the other." It thus appears that Bramhall, Prideaux, and Baxter, are the writers with whom Dr Hessey most closely agrees. "From the moment," says he, "on which Christ 'overcame the sharpness of death and opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers,' the first day of the week was invested with an interest not before attached to it, and became worthy of the new title which it afterwards obtained from the partakers in and preachers of Christ's resurrection." Without claiming for it a place in the category of positive institutions ordained by Christ Himself, Dr Hessey ranks it with Confirmation, which, though

usually called an Ecclesiastical ordinance, he believes on Scriptural grounds (Acts viii. 14–17, and xix. 1–6; Heb. vi. 2) to have had "an apostolic, and, so far as anything apostolic can be called divine, a divine origin. . . . It would appear, then," says he, "that if Confirmation has this origin (which is generally admitted), and yet is of Ecclesiastical institution, the word Ecclesiastical has, in reference to it and to ordinances contemporaneous with it and observed on the same grounds, a high and peculiar sense. In the Ecclesia and its authorities at that time were included inspired men, who, in reference to what they practised (I do not mean as men, but as regulators of the Church), and what they ordained, were unable to err. *They* might say, in a sense, what the Church could never say afterwards, 'it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.' Whereas, ever since the time when the canon of Scripture was closed, although 'the Church has power to decree rites and ceremonies,' and is represented in general councils, yet her councils, being 'assemblies of men whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God.' In fact the Ecclesia afterwards was composed of uninspired men, who, though they might enjoin methods of procedure,—let us say for the carrying out of what appears in Scripture,—might not bestow upon their ordinances a divine and lasting obligation. We obtain, therefore, two distinct senses of the word Ecclesiastical—*the one*, co-extensive in the matters to which it applies with the term Apostolic, and in fact synonymous with it: *the other*, that in which it may be employed at the present hour, when, if deemed advisable, the Church might meet and make regulations, Ecclesiastical indeed, because they emanate from her, but only of human authority, and capable of being repealed the next day." And apostolic ordinances include "things ordained by the apostles, not merely in so many words, but by the precedents which they supply in their actions." (Pp. 31–34.) Now, he holds that the texts usually adduced from Scripture to prove that the Sabbath was tranferred from the seventh day to the first day, though giving no support whatever to that opinion, do show, "*first*, that peculiar associations would be necessarily connected in the minds of the apostles with the first day of the week; *secondly*, that on this day they were accustomed to meet, and recommended their followers to meet, and for certain religious objects; *thirdly*, that whether from such associations, or from the nature of the relation to their Lord into which they were thus brought on it, or from both united, the term 'Lord's Day' was actually applied by them to it. This," says he, "I think will at least amount to a high probability that the day would be chosen by the apostles as characteristic of the new dispensation, and to an evidence that it was so chosen. At any rate, if we may judge from parallel instances, it is all that the nature of the case allows." (Pp. 37, 38.) It is to be observed, however, that though acquainted with Sir William Domville's *Examination of the Six Texts, &c.* (above, pp. 261, 357), he makes no attempt to meet the argu-

ments there urged against the sufficiency of the texts to prove either that the apostles *were* accustomed to meet, and *recommended their followers* to meet, for certain religious objects, on the first day of the week, or that the term "Lord's-day" was ever applied to it by them. Among the reasons adduced by Dr Hessey against the opinion that the law of the Sabbath is *moral*, the following is stated in p. 134: "Had it been one of the laws of nature, there would not, I humbly conceive, have been assigned as reasons for its observance, in one passage, a fact which could not have been known except by revelation, 'God's working six days and resting the seventh;' in another, a fact which occurred long after man was created, and in which not humanity in general, but one nation only was interested. 'God brought thee forth out of Egypt, therefore God commanded thee to keep the seventh day' (Deut. v. 15)." But he nowhere discusses the question, which of the two copies of the Fourth Commandment wherein these two reasons severally appear, is to be received as genuine. And although he agrees with Baxter (above, p. 31), that in the first three centuries the day was reverenced "as an ordinance existing in and dating from the lifetime of the inspired apostles," (see Hessey, p. 88; and his extract from Baxter in p. 386), yet he does nothing to parry the objection so forcibly stated by Domville (i. 302–313, and Suppl.), that none of the ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries has attributed the origin of Sunday-observance to either an injunction or the example of the apostles, although other reasons, some of them inadmissible and even absurd, are assigned. Of sundry historical details presented by Dr Hessey in the course of his Lectures, I shall avail myself in the Supplement to the first volume of the present work. Such of them as relate to the growth of ecclesiastical Sabbatarianism in the Church of Rome during the fourth and fifth centuries have already been referred to above, p. 383–4; and on another point, reference was made to it in p. 340. The book has been criticised in several theological and literary journals, including *The Christian Remembrancer* and *The North British Review*, both for January 1861.—*Christianity and its Counterfeits; a Word for Jesus*, by THE FOLLOWERS OF JESUS (post 8vo, N.D.), vol. ii., parts 5 and 6, on "the Sin of Judaizing," and "the Sin of Sabbatizing, and the Lord's-day Festival."*—*The True Scriptural Sabbath vindicated and enforced, and the Anti-Scriptural Character of what is called "The Christian Sabbath" exposed: being a review of Professor Miller's late pamphlet on the "Physiology of the Sabbath;"* by ROBERT HAMILTON, M.D., Edin. [1855]. Here "the true scriptural Sabbath" is regarded, "1. as the believer's sabbatism, essentially enjoyed by every one who has fled from the wrath to come, and has found a hiding-place

* This series of tracts on Christianity and its Counterfeits is not sold, but may be obtained gratuitously by sending a written request for it, or any of its parts, to J. R. E., care of Mr Maclaren, bookseller, Princes Street, Edinburgh.

from the storm and tempest, in the sacrifice once offered upon Calvary's cross; 2. as the Christian's life; and 3. as the Lord's-day Festival, appointed by Christ in connection with the Lord's-day." This book ought to have been named before.

Some treatises which could not well be classified as either Sabbatarian or Dominical remain to be mentioned. Both sides are argued in *The British Controversialist*, vol. iv. pp. 8, 48, 88, 127 (Lond. 1853); in a *Discussion at Exeter Hall on the Sunday Question, between the* Rev. ROBERT MAGUIRE, M.A., *Incumbent of Clerkenwell, and* J. BAXTER LANGLEY, *Vice-President of the National Sunday League, on 16th and 17th Dec.* 1857 (Lond. 1858; post 8vo, pp. 71); in a *Discussion between* Mr J. BAXTER LANGLEY and Mr ROBERT COURT, *representative of the Glasgow Protestant Laymen's Association, in the City Hall there*, on 10th, 11th, and 18th Nov. 1858 (Glasg. [1858]; post 8vo, pp. 94); and, to some extent, in *The Sabbath, the Sunday, and the Paisley Coffee-Room; being Controversial Letters by the* Rev. JOHN. THOMSON, *of Free St George's, Paisley, and* Mr JAMES J. LAMB (Paisley, 1858; 8vo, pp. 48).—In an article (by the late Dr SAMUEL BROWN) headed *Sunday in the Nineteenth Century*, in the *North British Review* for Feb. 1853, the subject is somewhat peculiarly handled.—*The Encyclopædia Britannica*, 8th ed., vol. xix. (Edin. 1859) contains an article SABBATH, in which, while the primeval origin of the institution is asserted, the writer seems to think that the Lord's-day is not the Sabbath. "Although," says he, "it was, in the primitive times, indifferently called the Lord's-day or Sunday, yet it was never denominated the Sabbath; a name constantly appropriated to Saturday, or the seventh day, both by sacred and ecclesiastical writers. Of the change from the seventh to the first day of the week, or even of the institution of the Lord's-day festival, there is no account in the New Testament. However, it may be fairly inferred from it, that the first day of the week was, in the apostolic age, a stated time for public worship. . . . Thus it would appear from several passages in the New Testament [Acts ii. 1; xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2], that the religious observation of the first day of the week is of apostolical appointment; and may indeed be very reasonably supposed to be amongst those directions and instructions which our blessed Lord himself gave to his disciples during the forty days between his resurrection and ascension, in which he conversed with them, and spoke of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God. Still, however, it must be owned that those passages, although the plainest that occur, are not sufficient to prove the apostolical institution of the Lord's-day, or even the actual observation of it. In order, therefore, to place the matter beyond all controversy, recourse must be had to ecclesiastical testimony. . . . When the empire became Christian, Constantine and his successors made laws for the more solemn observation of the Lord's-day; they prohibited all prosecutions and pleadings, and other juridical matters, to be transacted on it, and also all unnecessary labour; not that it was

looked upon as a Jewish Sabbath, but because these things were considered as inconsistent with the duties of the festival." In the Supplement to vol. i. of the present work will be found quoted a strange argument of the writer against the astronomical origin of weeks.—*The State Church, a Sermon preached before the University of Oxford on 5th Nov.* 1850, by the Rev. BADEN POWELL, asserts in regard to Sabbath-keeping and other religious observances, that the State cannot legislate on any other ground than the real or supposed *beneficial influence* of its measures, and has no right to do so upon any *abstract plea of religious obligation*, which many may not recognise, and of the truth or grounds of which the Legislature cannot be judges.—A little treatise published several years ago, and entitled *The Christian Sabbath, or Rest in Jesus*, by ROBERT MACNAIR (Lond. N.D., Trübner & Co.; 12mo. pp. 83), discusses with great ability and knowledge the questions, 1. Is the Christian Sabbath a day? and, 2. If not a day, what is it? After considering all the passages of Scripture that bear on the subject, he concludes that Christians are not bound by the command to keep one day in seven, and that the true Christian Sabbath "is for a man to be united to Christ, and by this union to give up his own will, to cease from, or become dead to sin, and being made free from sin, to become a servant to righteousness." —Another deserves to be mentioned: *Days of Rest for the Human Labourer: a Prize Essay on the Necessity and Advantage of periodical Cessation from Labour; argued from the physical and mental constitution, the social relations, sources of enjoyment, and means of subsistence, of Man*, by HENRY KIRBY ATKINSON (Lond. 1850; 8vo, pp. 60).

The following elaborate volume, in which the strictest Sabbatarianism of the Scotch Presbyterians is advocated and enforced, was published too late to be mentioned under the proper head: *The Sabbath viewed in the Light of Reason, Revelation, and History, with Sketches of its Literature*, by the Rev. JAMES GILFILLAN, Stirling (Edin. 1861; cr. 8vo, pp. 571). Contents: I. Sketches of Literature and Controversies: 1. Prior to the Reformation; 2. From the Reformation to the present time. II. Adaptations and advantages of the Sabbath: 1. Relation of the law of sacred rest to the physical nature and well-being of man; 2. Adaptation of the Sabbath to the constitution and improvement of the human mind; 3. Moral and religious influence of the Sabbath; 4. Economy of a weekly holy day; 5. Influence of the Sabbath on the respectability and happiness of individuals; 6. Its domestic benefits; 7. Its advantages to nations. III. Divine origin and authority of the Sabbath: 1. Proofs from its adaptations and advantages; 2. Divine institution at the Creation, and observance by the Patriarchs; 3. Promulgated from Sinai as one of the commandments of the Moral Law; 4. The Sabbath under a change of day, a Christian ordinance and law; 5 and 6. Duties of the Sabbath, namely sacred rest, sacred service, public worship; 7. Divine estimate of the importance of the Sabbath. IV. The Sabbath in history: 1. Traces of septenary institutions

among Pagan nations; weeks; respect to the septenary number, &c.; 2. The Sabbath or Lord's-day in centuries I.–III.; 3 and 4. In centuries IV.–XV.; 5. At the Reformation; 6. After the Reformation. V. The Sabbath vindicated: 1. Theories tried by the principles of the divine government; 2. by Scripture in its obvious meaning and general scope; 3. by divine predictions. 4. Proposed substitutes for the Sabbath: the scheme which proposes a holy day either in whole or in part devoted to amusement, condemned by experience and physiology; the plan to open the Crystal Palace and places for instruction in science and art, impracticable, and would be inefficient; the plea for such expedients, which is, that strict Sabbath-keeping is demoralizing, demonstrated by facts to be utterly groundless and absurd; 5. Desecration of the Sabbath at home and abroad; 6. Causes of this desecration; 7. Remedies; 8. Concluding appeal. Appendix: Testimonies on behalf of the Sabbath. Some of the historical parts of this work will be noticed in the Supplement to my first volume. The objections against opening the Crystal Palace and the like on Sundays, which Mr Henry Rogers has so powerfully stated in his *Three Letters to a Friend* (see above, p. 346; also Dr Hook's remarks quoted in p. 371) are more briefly urged by Mr Gilfillan in Section V. chap. 4. "Who does not know," says he, "that the call of so many for a Sabbath of amusement and pleasure, either in whole or in part,* is in reality the demand of such a mode of spending its hours as must subject multitudes to continual labour and its fatal results, that others may enjoy rest and indulgence? Do those men sincerely believe that a Sabbath-day is desirable as a season of respite from the toils of life, who plead for a system which, providing for the gain of some, and the recreation, the amusement, and the vices of others, at the expense of their fellows, has a direct tendency to undermine health, exhaust the strength, and shorten the lives of those who are its victims? On the supposition, so contrary to all experience, that no vice were indulged, it is an unanswerable objection to Sunday excursions by trains and otherwise, and to all public amusements on that day, that the health of thousands, employed in affording the means of pleasure to others, is necessarily sacrificed." (P. 503.) But the same objection applies to those who now, with the general sanction, labour on the Sunday for the good of others (see above, p. 360–1); and the advocates of Sunday recreation, to which the labour of a few contributes, see no reason why those who work with this object on the Sunday should not rest on another day, and also take their turn with others in doing the Sunday work. It is customary and beneficial to sleep by night and work by day; yet thousands work in the night and sleep while

* The only "call" that I have heard of, is for the means of recreation on a part of the Sunday for those who need it, and are incapable of "spending the whole day in the public and private exercises of God's worship."

others labour * The following extracts from various pamphlets will show the chief arguments by which the objections to the opening of the Crystal Palace on Sunday afternoons are met: "Many," says the Rev. James Baldwin Brown, "expect that people will go to the Crystal Palace to see the sight, and, when they have seen it, will go to the public-houses and finish there. Such a view is both shallow and faithless. No doubt, those who like to think so will find plenty which will appear to sustain their views. 'The people' is a vague term. It needs patient and intelligent observation, not on the outskirts, but in the centre of a great popular movement, to discern its character. The experience of the last few years does not confirm such anticipations. The working-classes who visit the Museum in Great Russell Street, the Zoological Gardens on Monday, Hampton Court, and Kew, add nothing to the disorder and drunkenness of the metropolis. It is wonderfully rare, even in the more distant exhibitions and places of intelligent enjoyment which have been mentioned, to meet with disorder. Certainly, the drunkenness and disorder of London have been greatly diminished by the opening of places of resort for the working-classes, where mind as well as body may be fed. Everything in the past justifies the extension of the experiment, and on the grandest scale. To the poor man, these things are not so much exhibitions as they are to us who can more frequent them. They partake of the dignity of events, stir up the fountains of manhood, perhaps long stagnant, and make him feel life's meaning and life's worth, and thus they expand his soul. Now, it is worth while seriously to consider—Is this *different* from the object which God proposed in the institution of the Sabbath-day? It stops far short of that object; but, as far as it goes, does it not travel in the same direction, and aim at the lifting man up from the brutish condition into which a too slavish daily toil would plunge him, to feel how much a man is better than a brute? . . . The gist of the matter seems to lie here:—at present, we have but slight hold on the working-classes; they care not for our Sabbaths, and find no pleasure in our worship. Is it right, on the ground that it would be a formal breach of that Sabbath which is now really and flagrantly violated, to refuse our consent to a movement which will secure for them some portion, at any rate, of benefit on the Lord's-day? . . . The last, and in the estimation of a large number of religious men, the most serious aspect of the question which I will refer to is this:—'The opening of the Crystal Palace,' it is said, 'is but the door to the opening of the national institutions, the theatres, and, finally, the factories and shops on the Sabbath. But there is evidently a

* An excellent example has lately been set by the Manchester City Council: on 3d April 1861, they determined to give all the members of the police force one day's complete rest in every fortnight, and to effect this humane and wise purpose by adding one-fourteenth to the number of the men.

limiting principle at work, recognised by the public, and expressed by the Government. The limitation of the hours, the clause against the sale of spirituous liquors, and the close of that portion of the building which would involve actual handiwork, are recognised by the public at once as right and seemly. There is a public feeling in England which will care for these things, which are supposed to be imperilled; a public feeling which, during the next years, it will be the office of the Church to nurture and unfold. If that public feeling fail us, then, unquestionably, our condition will be most serious; and the question must be argued, how far a Government may maintain, in the face of public feeling, a system of preventions and prohibitions? That it has the right, up to a certain point, most people feel; that there is a point beyond which it is most unsafe, all are agreed. But that point will never be reached in England, while the Church is faithful to her country and to her Lord. If that point will ever be reached, on us will be the sin. Ministers of the Church of Christ! there has been too long a schism in the army. The shepherds have been battling for precedence and prerogative, and the sheep have strayed. The call to us now is for work; work—not by platform crudities, vanities, and falsities; not by protests, preventions, petitions, and bills of spiritual rights;—but by earnest, manful, godly, spiritual effort to make the Gospel known and felt as the power of God unto salvation." (*The Sabbath, the Crystal Palace, and the People*, 1853, pp. 22, 24, 33.)—"We are no Judaizers," says Mr Edward Higginson, "and yet we gratefully bless Judaism for our day of rest. We bless the superstition, if it were such, of the early Christian Church, which urged the first Christian emperors to enact a cessation from toil on Sunday, because the Jews had rested on Saturday, and Jesus Christ had risen from the dead on Sunday morning.* The day of rest is an invaluable blessing to all the toiling multitudes of Christendom. If Christians have argued absurdly for the *authority* of the Christian Sabbath from that of the Jewish, not less certain is the historical fact, that for our possession of one day in seven as, generally speaking, exempt from severe toil, we are ultimately indebted to the Law of Moses. . . . We believe it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of a recurring day of rest, whether in a bodily or a spiritual point of view. That it was ordained by Judaism, seems a sufficient proof of more than human wisdom presiding in that remarkable institution. The Christian world did well, therefore, to copy it, whether, through a feeling of duty or a mere sense of its blessedness. What would life be to our toiling millions without their Sunday? What to those in easier circumstances, but engaged in severer toil of head and heart, with business anxieties and cares which the mere hand-worker does not know? The Jewish use of it as REST, if it were no more, is a luxury and cordial to the working-day

* These emperors, however, assigned no reasons for their laws.

world. Our toiling workmen should love and cherish their charter of rest. And it seems somewhat wilful and wayward on the part of those who seek authority from Judaism for their Sabbatical strictness, not to adopt the simple Jewish idea of rest and refreshment to wearied human nature, which was always the leading character of the Jewish Sabbath. The very word *Sabbath* means rest, cessation; no more, no less. . . . Before synagogue worship was known, we ask the ascetic Sabbatarian to imagine how the pious Jew spent his Sabbath; and after its introduction, we have no idea that the Jewish Sabbath lost its character of a day of cheerful rest and refreshment, except among the Pharisaic sort of people.* It was a festival, a day of gladness and exultation, not of gloom and sorrow. The Jews among us at the present day, who keep it sacredly, do not keep it ascetically. So that the Judaizing argument will not bear out the conclusion attempted. The Pharisaic observance was repudiated by Christ in his emphatic words, 'The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.' . . . The Sabbatarians falsely charge their opponents with the desire to rob the poor man of his Sabbath. We believe the secular world would be quite as strenuous in opposing any such robbery as the 'evangelical.' Indeed there is no party to attempt such a wrong. We only regret that the merits of the Sabbath should be disguised by overstating or false argument. Let it rest on its own blessedness as fulfilling a human want, which does not grow less urgent, but the contrary, with the progress of civilization, competition, and great cities. . . . 'A divided Sabbath!' Yes; let us divide it well, and we shall find time for all its claims: for home, with its loves and duties—for healthy recreation—for mental quiet and reflection, so conducive to mental health—for converse with Nature, so little accessible to our daily communion amid houses and smoke—for public worship and Christian benevolence—and, in all and through all, for the religion of thankful and dutiful hearts!" (*The Crystal Palace and the Golden Day*, 1853, pp. 6, 8, 20).—"It is notorious," says "An Englishman" in his *Letter to the Evangelicals*, "that *now* our only place of amusement on Sunday is the public-house; and it is a fair argument, that many would prefer the Museum to the public-house if they had their choice. Why should they not have their choice?—if the spiritual robbery be equal, the social benefit is most on one side. I know it is said, that the Museum would tempt as many from Church as from the public-house; a poor compliment, in my opinion, to Church and Chapel, and all who attend them:—much good may their attendance do, if the Museum can tempt

* Some injustice, I think, is done here to the Pharisees. Though scrupulous as to trivial acts which they regarded as *work*, they are nowhere represented in Scripture as hostile to *recreation* on the Sabbath. They walked through the fields on that day, as Jesus and his disciples did (Matt. xii. 2), and it was one of the chief Pharisees who made on a Sabbath the feast at which our Lord was one of the numerous guests. (Luke xiv.)

them away. But let us give the argument fair play—say that it did tempt some away from quiet thought and just reproof: there can be no question that it would tempt far more away from the sole relaxation of the public-house, and so far, the balance is in favour of the Museum. Besides, there is sometimes both wisdom and duty in choosing the least of two evils. On this ground many are inclined to open the British Museum who do not contend that to do so is abstractedly right. And many of those who talk so well of the refining and improving influence of the fine arts are unconsciously trying to hide from themselves that their real standing-ground is on the questionable choice of the least of two evils. For this is not a dignified position, therefore *we* seek to disguise it under 'the refining and improving influences of the fine arts,' trying, if we can, to change the least of two evils into something that may seem a positive good. But are we not warranted in choosing the least of two evils? we do so on every other occasion, why not on this? The large majority of those who would go to the British Museum, are now going to worse places. Is it not better that they should go to the Museum, and are we not justified in tempting them to go." (P. 5).—"I quite agree with Coleridge" (as quoted above, p. 372), says George Dawson, "in a wish for a quiet, decent Sunday. I would prohibit all compulsory labour, and avoid anything approaching to a Paris Sunday,—which is the bugbear we are to be frightened with now, if any relaxation in our rigidness is allowed. I protest against the connection of the two things. There is a pamphlet which some of the clergy are busily circulating just now, boring us with some man's experiences of a Sunday in Paris. The man seems never to have left his mother's apronstring before; and never to have heard of anybody's ways except in his own parish,—and he goes over, and comes back to tell us of all the noise and bustle of a Paris Sunday. It seems he actually saw six or seven men paving a street on a Sunday there. We can't help that. What have we to do with that? But I deny altogether the conclusions. We are not the French, thank God! Though they are very good as Allies and friends, may the day be far from us when we shall so far desert the ways of our forefathers as to wish to keep Sunday as they do! It is a flimsy and pitiful argument to say that because England is considering the expediency of removing certain restrictions, therefore Englishmen are going to give up their quiet Sunday for the hum, and din, and bustle of a Parisian fête day. I say I reject the conclusion altogether; and I utterly deny that this movement is likely to lead to any such result. . . . . It is very easy for a man with Layard's Nineveh or Champollion on his bookshelves, to say to the working man, 'Why can't you go to the British Museum on a week-day?' In the first place, it is only open by daylight; no candles are allowed. And supposing a man was willing to go on a week-day, what right has any one to ask him to lose a day's work? A day's work is a day's food for his family. I can go any day. My work is

piece work, and it does not matter to my congregation when it is done, so it be done by the Saturday night; but am I to tell a man on day-wages that he must lose three shillings in order that he may see that for which all of us are taxed, and which is, in fact, as much the property of the poor man as of the rich? . . . . As to the Crystal Palace, I have such a fear of Mammonism, that as long as I know the opening of it on Sundays will put any profits into the pockets of the shareholders of the Palace and the Railway, I dread to lend my aid to do it. If the Government could in some way subsidize it, and open it freely on Sundays to the working man, then the doubt I have would vanish. Having settled that recreation is the right, privilege, and duty of Christian men, then comes the point, Who is to settle the nature of the recreation? My answer is—The individual, for the individual; Parliament, for the nation. The selection must be arbitrary and artificial. Some men say, 'Open the Museum and National Gallery, you must open wax-work and theatre; open theatre, you open shop; open shop, you open warehouse; open warehouse, your Sunday is gone!' Now is this fair reasoning? Are not all these questions obliged to be separated by a line? Are there not songs that you will have sung in your house, and songs that you would not listen to? Would it be a whit more reasonable to say, 'If you have Sunday music and do anything else besides short metre, you will have long metre; long metre will lead to common metre; common metre to peculiar metre; and by and by you will come to an anthem; from an anthem you will go to an oratorio; from oratorio to quasi-sacred opera; having Rossini you will get Verdi; from opera you will go to song; from song to ballad; from ballad to comic song; from comic song to tragedy; from tragedy and comedy to farce!' Would any man listen to such absurdity! Is it not possible for a nation like this, not yet lost to all wisdom, to draw some line that says—'The Museum, the Gallery of Art, we will open; but the dancing saloon and the theatre we will not!' 'If one,' you say, 'why not the other?' Simply because men of sense know they are not wanted; and because, as St Paul said, 'Though all things are lawful to me, all things are not expedient.'" (*The Christian Sunday not the Jewish Sabbath*, 1856, pp. 24, 35.)—"Can we," asks Mr Ierson, "preserve the day from servile labour, as we desire, if we do not venerate it ourselves, and teach the people to sanctify it, as the Sabbath of the fourth commandment? If not, if the nation cares so little for religion that the day would be lost when not supported upon the solid basis of Sinai, there cannot be much religion in its observance. One thing may be said here. The early Christians certainly kept the Lord's-day from simple motives of Christian suitableness, and the love of Christian worship. They kept it, moreover, at great disadvantage. The modern Sabbatic believer is greatly hurt that his ungodly neighbour should be left at liberty to buy and sell and get gain, while his own shutters have the seal of conscience upon them, and he may not take them down without losing caste in his reli-

gious society. But the early Christians kept Sunday when Sunday-keeping was not in any form the law of the land. Are we so weak in the faith that we can only be saved from giving up our Sunday service before the temptation of a few pounds and shillings, by an enacted law of a legislature which despises everything about the Puritan party but their vote, and which, in exchange for its poor thought of evangelical religion, that party often delights to pronounce an assembly of mere lost men of the world, having neither part nor lot in the matter. Oh, shame upon the cold religiousness of a Church which fears to lose its day of the Lord if that day's holiness may not be enforced upon the nation as the terrifically sanctioned Sabbath of the Law, and which thus creates a hundred forms of national hypocrisy in order to save itself from the small martyrdom of competition! . . . . . The excursion [of Jesus and his disciples on the Sabbath-day] through the fields was not thought to be wrong: but, as is often said in these days, 'See the sad consequences to which it led.' People who visit museums and country pleasure-gardens will need refreshment; and since in England it is not permitted them to pluck corn and rub it out for themselves on a stranger's property, and the literal example of the disciples is so far lost for us, other persons must be employed to meet their wants. In any case, they grow hungry, with all the frightful consequences which that painful but innocent feeling involves. At least, the human appetite keeps no Sabbath, and it may be worth a thought to observe how absolutely mankind feel on the Sunday exactly, in this respect, as on all other days. . . . . It is the custom of the pulpit to say that what the disciples were doing in the corn-field was a harmless thing. Of course it was, but only on the precise grounds which make it harmless for a poor man to carry home his family dinner from the Sunday bakehouse, or to seek refreshment in his Sunday walk in the only places where it can be procured. How otherwise could their deed be harmless, which no more sanctified, than do these modern actions, the holy day? It was contrary, as we have seen, to the Sabbath-law,—the only law which could pretend to have made it sinful. Does Jesus reprove his disciples? Does he even hint that they should have refrained from an act which wounded the religious feelings of the priest-ridden? On the contrary, he challenges the interpretation of the law. He is about to give the law another sense of his own—a sense more just to nature. The time had come to assail the force of prejudiced legalism; and knowing that what he is about to wound is rather a strength of pride than any weakness of the conscience, he defends what the disciples had done, because it was natural for them to do it, adding these forcible words, which surely have not yet lost power—'If ye had known what this meaneth, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," ye would not have condemned the guiltless.' . . . . The Church, instead of assisting men, and especially the poor, to turn the day of rest to noble uses, has forced their interest away from it by unwise and

absurd restrictions. Suppose, when the day of rest has come, they do not choose to go to church (the poor are not always without their reasons for even that enormity), whither shall they go? The day has been made what it was not meant to be,—a Sabbath, and everything but church-going is interdicted. Museums and lecture-rooms are shut up; no music is to be heard but that of a march which the regimental or other bands have stolen upon the Puritan public; no room is open for debate, no library, no reading or news-room; and even if the artisan can afford the boat or the rail, he finds nothing to do at the journey's end, no place to visit but a few open fields, attainable, for the most part, along dusty roads; and even in the fields no healthy recreation allowed. What remains but every temptation to drinking, and every chance of evil company? The good people, so considered, are all at church. The leaven of their kindly influence is wanting. The common people, simply because you cannot drive them to church (which you would willingly do), are left to their own uneducated tastes and courses, without one pathway open which might become to them the happy pathway to light and virtue. . . . . As to the sacrifice which some must make if the day be observed for any other than church purposes, it is a clear necessity; and if there be no Sabbath ideas falsely obtruded in the matter, there can be no offence in it to the conscience of any one. If sextons and gravediggers may work without offence,—if farm-servants and doctors must work,—if servants of all classes may, and do no sin,—and if policemen and others who keep order amongst us, rightly pursue on this day their proper calling,—say what becomes of the Sabbath principle? You are thankful to have your letters and your newspapers on the Monday morning; and why should there be no Sunday-schools but such only as profess to teach religion? Why should this or that place of pleasant improvement be closed, on the plea that it must multiply the workers? Certainly it must, and to most excellent purpose. It may not be the highest lesson of morals which the people would learn from seeing pictures or fossils, as one wise member of the House remarked, that 'art did not promote the affections or domestic truth.' The simple question is, what must be done for those who will not go to church, whom yet we desire to save from demoralising idleness? Open the lecture-rooms. These, at least, may form a pathway into the church, or may improve the people without it." (*The Sabbath of Paul and Jesus*, 1856, pp. 16, 19, 22, 25, 30.)—"In their endeavours," says the Reviewer of the Leicester Prize Essays on Sunday Amusements, "to prove that 'Sunday Amusements are opposed to the well-being of society,' the essayists, one and all, allege that if any portion of Sunday be devoted to merely educational and moral purposes, that if the sanctity which at present attaches to the day is in the least tampered with, the day will sink into a working day, and Mammon alone will gain the advantage. In illustration of this we are as universally referred to France, and to the manner in which the Parisians *employ* their

Sunday. Now, to us, this is the most serious view of the case, and we freely admit that working-men should be slow to countenance any proceedings which would be likely to increase their hours of labour, or to add in any degree to their social bondage. Still no bugbear should deter us from looking at the question to see if it is not possible to relax some of our rigidness, and to make the Sunday more acceptable and morally profitable to the thousands of 'used up' artizans of this country. And in doing this we would judge the question on its own merits, and as one amongst other cognate subjects included in *our own* social category. For we protest against the common practice of abstracting *our* position, in reference to Sunday, from our own native soil, planting it in another land, surrounding it with all sorts of incongruous elements and conflicting influences, and then asking us to own, accept, and adopt it! We will do no such thing. There is much in 'continental customs' that we think our countrymen might imitate to advantage. We do not monopolize all the achievements of intellect, or the refinements of art. And, in respect to sobriety and personal deportment, we fear that we suffer in comparison with our French neighbours. Still we will not have our staid people, and possibly too stable institutions, called up to judgment amidst the incongruities of Popish France, and the inconstancies of her fickle people. We have to consider what are the probabilities, and indeed the actualities with *us*. We will not be diverted from the inquiry as to the desirability and practicability of so interesting the thousands of our hard-worked operatives, that they shall be induced to employ the Sunday better than they do now. That is our plain and simple question. In attempting to practically test the matter, our essayists say we make things worse, as by recognising on the Sunday any other than positive religious agency we secularise the day, and endanger the working man's period of rest. Now, to this conclusion we at once demur. . . . What need for these essayists to produce medical certificates to bolster up an obsolete command, when in their own persons they could present a living claim for a more frequent Sabbath. Does not Nature, by her terrible penalties in cutting off our working population before reaching the average of thirty, proclaim a fearful infraction of her laws? There is a limit to human endurance, and we have long reached that point. We may shift and change, and mortgage a few hours, but no more in amount can be wrung out of the nerves and sinews of the working man. At that point Mammon is checkmated. The Sabbath will not bow down to him. Our annual holidays, Easter, Whitsuntide, and Christmas, have not done so, although they have long ceased to be holy days. The tendency now is to an abridgment, rather than to an extension of the hours of labour. People begin to think that there is something else to live for besides working, sleeping, and attending to animal wants. One-day-saintism is but poor compensation for the crushing, stifling, and blunting, during six days, of the noblest aspirations of humanity. We must exist under better influences

every day of the week. We have intellectual and social wants which must be supplied. We direct our attention to sanitary improvement, to popular education, to temperance movements, and to improved recreations for the people. We are instituting moral and social creeds and formulæ, and calling into action bodies of men for their elucidation and application. This implies the occupation of time. The mental and moral, as well as the religious nature of man, demand *their* Sabbaths, or opportunities for exercise and culture. Hence we have movements for half-holidays, earlier closing of business, and for additional annual holidays. Thus the necessities of our nature not only hedge round the present period of rest, but the development of other objects actually stipulates for further cessation from toil, that additional opportunities may be offered for moral and social improvement. We maintain, therefore, that the Sunday is now more secure to the working man, as a social arrangement, and as a day of rest, than it ever was, and that it is neither at the mercy of a man who understands a Hebrew root, nor at the bidding of any musician who on that day shall blow his trumpet on the Leicester race-course!" (*The Sunday Question, &c.*, 1857, pp. 19–22.)—Lastly, "A Clergyman of twenty-five years standing," puts the question, "Has their experience of human nature taught these well meaning and eminent persons [the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of London and Winchester], that the public can be *forced* into churches and chapels by the simple process of stopping up all other outlets for oral or ocular gratification on the Lord's-day? Would that it were so! but I am sorry to say my own observation has led me to arrive at a somewhat different conclusion. And I should rather apprehend, that the *known* opposition of the hierarchy, and their other spiritual leaders, to such an innocent recreation as an occasional visit to the Crystal Palace on the Sunday, would have the effect of alienating the affections of the million, and tend to give them a distaste to religion altogether, as to a thing gendered of austerity, and repulsive to the more genial emotions of our nature. . . . Though it is needless I trust for me, as a clergyman, to say that the glories of nature or the achievements of art can never, under any circumstances, become a *substitute* for the lessons of piety and godliness, which it is our business to inculcate, yet I am convinced that the more freely our congregations are led to the reception of these last, the more sure and lasting will be the fruit that comes by hearing our discourses.

'Small profit grows where is no pleasure ta'en;'

and I should look for but a cold and languid attention from ears brought by compulsion within my reach, while the body felt aggrieved at being debarred, in any measure by my instrumentality, from an occasional and innocent enjoyment thus *needlessly* put in competition with the precepts or practice of religion. Needlessly, I say; for it is not probable, nay, it is highly improbable, that the *same* individuals would *frequently* avail themselves of the

privilege, even if conceded, of visiting the Palace or its Gardens (from a distance) on the Sunday. Satiety in some instances, the power of being 'able to go at any time,' in others, would quickly take off the edge of the appetite now so keen. The bauble no longer withheld would be despoiled of half its interest:

> 'The lovely thing so fiercely sought,
> Would lose its charm by being caught;
> And every touch that woo'd its stay
> Would brush its brightest hues away.'

And after a third, or perhaps a fourth Sunday ramble in the Palace Gardens, the better part of our flocks would settle quietly on the humbler attractions of their own neighbourhood and parish church, and would listen with now unalienated affections to their respected minister, as he proves to them as one having authority, but without austerity, that there is but one thing that is not vanity, but one thing of which it can be predicated with truth that all her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace. It must not be overlooked, moreover, in regarding the question in this view, that it was never proposed, or desired by any one that I have heard of, to open the Palace or its Gardens for the whole of the Sunday. All that was ever contemplated, to the best of my belief, has been to admit the public from about two P.M. in the summer, and from about one P.M. during the winter months, closing the doors at about nine P.M. and dusk respectively, much as is done with St James's Park and others, I believe, in the vicinity of the metropolis. Any persons therefore who pleased, would still be at liberty to attend the morning or evening service in their parish church; even supposing (which I have already assumed would *not* be the case), that the *same* individuals would make it their *practice* to visit the Palace on a Sunday; and I imagine that even the most rigid stickler for a twice a-day attendance at church would hardly ask for or expect a thrice a-day attendance from any one; or if they do, I fear they would find the *ne quid nimis* axiom speedily verified in this case as in others, the overstrained bow recoil violently upon their hands. . . . They tell us of the refreshment houses opened in the vicinity of Sydenham, the attendance called into existence by the unusual pressure of the crowd, the cabs, omnibusses, railways, and other vehicles for the purpose of locomotion, all of which it is not to be denied are made use of more or less in violation of the Fourth Commandment. But do those who raise this objection (and it is the only one worth a moment's consideration), profess to be able to *put down* this mode of violating the strict letter of the law, by forbidding the stream to set in *this particular direction?* Is Sabbath-breaking so much more offensive in the sight of God, if perpetrated S. by S.E., than if it took the opposite quarter of the compass, and delighted to revel N. by N.W.? Are Hampstead-heath, Highgate-hill, Barnet, Holloway, or Hornsey, so perfectly innocent of desecration of the Lord's-day that we must send all our south, and south-eastern

and south-western populace into those salubrious quarters for fresh air and lessons of morality, rather than at Sydenham? For, as for supposing they will *stop at home* on the fifty-two Sundays in the year to please the Rev. Dr Rule, I hope that amiable and talented gentleman is not possessed with such an exalted idea of his powers of eloquence, as to dream of such an Elysium on earth. But then, again, we are pleasantly reminded of the 'thin edge of the wedge.' The old story over again. Where is it all to stop? —Why, stop at Sydenham, to be sure!—and when you find *another* Sydenham—another Crystal Palace, comparable to that eighth wonder of the world—then be it time enough to talk of the danger of a bad precedent, and the evil of once opening the door. There is no fair analogy between the Palace, under its present admirable regulations, and the question of theatres or concerts; or even of museums, picture galleries, and the like, though these last stand on far better ground than the former two. And no man would be justified, however he might attempt it, in inferring from the concession of the one privilege his *right* to demand the other." (*The Sunday Opening, &c.*, 1859, pp. 1, 3, 6.) On this subject see likewise an article in *The National Sunday League Record*, p. 17.

The propriety and expediency of spending part of the Lord's-day in wholesome recreation, and supplying the working classes in large towns with the means of doing so, is maintained also in the preface to *A Sunday in London*, by J. M. CAPES, M.A. (Lond. 1850; post 8vo, pp. 291).—That it should not be a day of penance is urged by Miss SEDGWICK, in her *Home*, chap. vi.; by Mrs HARRIET BEECHER STOWE, in *Four Ways of Observing the Sabbath* (Lond. N.D.; 18mo, pp. 49); in *Fraser's Magazine* for Jan. 1860, p. 6; in a *Letter* by the Rev. JOHN GRIFFITH, vicar of Aberdare in South Wales, quoted in *Sabbath Laws*, p. 449; in Dr Hessey's 8th *Bampton Lecture;* and by many of the writers above-mentioned. We may note also, *The Royal Dublin Society and the Citizens of Dublin: Why should Exclusiveness and Sabbatarianism be the rule at the Glasnevin Botanic Garden, whilst under Her Majesty, at Kew, free admission is the rule on all the days of the week, and on Sunday?* (Dublin, 1860; 8vo, pp. 16.)—In GEORGE COMBE'S *Moral Philosophy*, Lecture 18, on the Religious Duties of Man, the following remarks on the Fourth Commandment occur: "Every line of our bodily and mental constitution coincides with this precept. . . . Indeed, our natural constitution commands not only an extent of repose from labour equal to that prescribed by the commandment, but greatly more. It imposes on us the duty of resting from labour several hours every day in our lives, and dedicating them to the study and practice of the will of God. The observance, however, which it prescribes of the seventh day, is somewhat different from that taught by human interpreters of the Fourth Commandment. On this subject, the New Testament is silent, so that the *mode* of observing Sunday is left to the discretion of men. Our Scottish divines, in general,

forbid walking or riding, or any other form of exercise and recreation on Sundays, as a contravention of the Fourth Commandment. In our constitution, on the other hand, God proclaims that while incessant labour, through its influence on the mental organs, blunts our moral, intellectual, and religious faculties, abstinence from all bodily exertion, and the practice of incessant mental application for one entire day, even on religion, are also injurious to the welfare of both body and mind; and that on the seventh day there is no exception to the laws which regulate our functions on other days. These require that air, exercise, and mental relaxation should alternate with moral, religious, and intellectual studies. Accordingly, natural theology teaches us to transfer a portion of the Sunday's rest and holiness to every one of the other days of the week, and to permit on the Sundays as much of air, exercise, and recreation as will preserve the mental organs in the best condition for performing their moral, religious, and intellectual duties. You are aware that, on the continent of Europe, Sunday is devoted, to some extent, to recreation. This may be carried too far there; but unless the Scriptures abrogate the law written by God in our constitution, we in Scotland have erred a little in the opposite extreme. The force of this observation can be appreciated only by those who are acquainted with the physiology of the brain. The difference between the expounder of the Bible and him who unfolds the natural laws, is this: The former, when he departs from the natural laws, can enforce his interpretations of Scripture only by an arm of flesh. If men refuse to forego air, exercise, and recreation on the seventh day, the divine may refuse them church privileges, or call in the police to fine and imprison them; but he can do no more. He cannot change the nature of the mind and body; nor will the Creator punish the people for not acting as their teacher desires them, in opposition to the natural laws. The interpreter of the Book of Nature, on the other hand, may wield no arm of flesh; but he is enabled to point to the power of God enforcing the divine laws, and to demonstrate that punishment is inseparably connected with infringement, and reward with obedience." (Pp. 410–412; 2d ed.; Edin. 1841, post 8vo.)

In order that weekly recreation, which all admit to be needful, may be obtained by labourers without the employment of Sunday for the purpose—and on the assumption that they may usefully abstain from it during the whole of Sunday, which many deny—an agitation for a Saturday half-holiday has of late years been extensively carried on;* and a better observance of other ecclesias-

* *Government Legal and General Saturday Half-Holiday: Report of the great public meeting in the Guildhall, 15th August* 1855; *also Correspondence, compiled by* J. R. TAYLOR, 4th ed. (Lond. 1857; 8vo, pp. 87).—*Saturday Half-Holidays, and earlier payment of wages: speeches delivered at Exeter-Hall meeting, April* 24, 1856, *with an Appendix*, and List of Works on the Labour Question, 2d ed. (Lond., Kent and Co., N.D.; 8vo, pp. 48).—*The Half-Holiday Question considered, with some Thoughts on*

tical holidays than Sunday has been advocated by the Rev. WILLIAM GRAPEL, B.A., in a pamphlet entitled *The Church's Holidays the only safeguard against the Desecration of the Lord's-day* (Lond. 1848; 8vo, pp. 28).—This is the place to mention also an article on *Sunday in London*, by the Rev. T. F. STOOKS, M.A., in *Meliora, or Better Times to Come*, edited by Viscount Ingestre, 2d series, p. 156 (Lond. 1853).

Those who wish to read sermons respecting the Sabbath and the Lord's-day will find references to many, in the volume of Darling's *Cyclopædia Bibliographica* containing "Subjects: Holy Scriptures" (royal 8vo, Lond. 1859), columns 159, 160, 219, 226, 227, 235, 244, 249, 259, 346, 465, 638, 639, 677, 798, 847, 848, 923, 924, 967, 969, 1003, 1004, 1048, 1205, 1206, 1216, 1380, 1425, 1508, 1600, 1616, 1751.

Of the British SEVENTH-DAY BAPTISTS in the present century there is but little to record. At its commencement, the Rev. T. EDMONDS having published *A Scriptural Representation of the Abolition of the Fourth Commandment, as far as it relates to the Observance of a particular day; and a Vindication of their conduct who observe the first day as their Sabbath* (Lond. 1801, 12mo), Mrs ANN ALSOP replied in *Remarks on the Rev. T. Edmonds' pamphlet, &c., and an attempt to vindicate their conduct who observe the seventh-day Sabbath according to the express words of the Fourth Commandment* (Lond. 1801, 8vo); which elicited in the same year *A Further Consideration of the Arguments of the Sabbatarians* (12mo).—I find nothing more till 1825, when there appeared *Remarks on the Different Sentiments entertained in Christendom relative to the Weekly Sabbath*, by ROBERT BURNSIDE, A.M., who was then the minister of a congregation of Seventh-day Baptists in London (Lond. 1825; 12mo, pp. 354). Contents: 1. Differences of opinion concerning the nature of a weekly Sabbath; 2. Concerning the obligation of a weekly Sabbath; 3. Concerning the antiquity of the seventh day weekly Sabbath; 4. Concerning the regard paid by the Patriarchs and the Gentiles to the seventh day weekly Sabbath; 5. Concerning the seventh day observed by the Jews; 6. Concerning the supposed repeal of the seventh day weekly Sabbath; 7. Concerning the claim of the first day to be the weekly Sabbath by Divine authority; 8. Concerning the supposed authority of apostolic tradition to render it such; 9. Concerning the commencement and termination of the Scriptural weekly Sabbath; 10. Concerning the supposed lawfulness of man to transfer it to another day; 11. Concerning the supposed authority of man to institute a weekly Sabbath; 12. Concerning the importance of the grounds on which sanctification is claimed for a day as the weekly Sabbath, and its

the instructive and healthful Recreations of the Industrial Classes, by JOHN LILWALL, Honorary Secretary of the Early Closing Association, 2d ed. (Lond., Kent and Co. 1856; 8vo, pp. 60). Objections to the proposed Half-Holiday are stated in *The National Sunday League Record*, No. 5, p. 33.

obtaining that sanctification. 13. Conclusion. The work is a calm, clear, and ample statement of the grounds on which this sect of Christians keep Saturday as the Sabbath, and maintain that all who believe in a primeval Sabbath-law and in the universal and perpetual obligation of the Decalogue are bound to do the like.—Shortly afterwards was published *The Authority of Jehovah Asserted; or a Scriptural Plea for the Seventh-day Weekly Sabbath, as the only Sabbath ever given by God to Man: being a complete refutation of all the arguments in favour of the First-day Claims, brought by the Editors of the Baptist Magazine in their review of "A Small Tribute to the Memory of the late Robert Burnside, A.M.," in their number for August* 1826; *With some few remarks on the article on Milton's Essay on the Sabbath and the Lord's Day which appeared in the Evangelical Magazine for Sept.* 1826 (Lond. 1826; 8vo, pp. 47).—The only later British work on this side, with which I am acquainted, is *An Examination of the Authority for the Change of the Weekly Sabbath at the Resurrection of Christ; proving that the practice of the Church in substituting the first day of the week for the appointed seventh day is unsanctioned by the New Testament Scriptures*, by JAMES A. BEGG (Glasg. 1851). This book is noticed in Kitto's *Journal of Sacred Literature* for October 1851, p. 227.—An account of the Seventh-day Baptists (till lately called Sabbatarians), is to be found in Adam's *Religious World Displayed*, iii. 416–422 (Edin. 1809). In a recent pamphlet, entitled *System in Revelation*, by PATRICK M'FARLANE, p. 25 (Edin. 1860), there appears a strong tendency to the opinion that the first day of the week has been rashly and unwarrantably substituted for the seventh.*

IN THE UNITED STATES the controversies on the Sabbath Ques-

* The following are the names of the London publishers of the chief works above named, which have appeared since 1845:—ARTHUR: Hamilton, Adams, & Co.—BAYLEE: Seeleys.—BROWN: Hall, Virtue, & Co.—CANDLISH: Nisbet & Co.—CAPES: Longman & Co.—CLIFFORD: Effingham Wilson.—CONDER: Patriot Office.—COX: Simpkin & Co.—CRANBROOK: E. T. Whitfield.—DOMVILLE: Chapman & Hall.—FAIRBAIRN: Hamilton, Adams, & Co.—FULTON: J. Chapman.—R. W. HAMILTON: Jackson and Walford.—HESSEY: J. Murray.—HEURTLEY: J. H. and J. Parker.—HIGGINSON: E. T. Whitfield.—M. HILL: J. F. Shaw.—HOOK: J. Murray.—IERSON: J. Chapman.—IRWIN: Rivingtons.—JOHNSTONE: Wertheim & Macintosh.—JORDAN: Partridge & Oakey.—M'CRIE: R. Theobald.—MACNAIR: Trübner & Co.—M'OWAN: J. Mason.—MAURICE: J. W. Parker & Son.—MERRYWEATHER: Simpkin & Co.—NAYLER: Trübner & Co.—NEALE: J. Murray.—OLIVER: R. Groombridge & Sons.—AN OXFORD M.A. Effingham Wilson.—PIRRET: Hamilton, Adams & Co.—PICKARD: Longman & Co.—POWELL: Longman & Co.—ROBERTSON: Smith, Elder, & Co.—ROGERS: Longman & Co.—RUSSELL: Blackwood & Sons.—SLACK: National Sunday League.—STEWART: Nisbet & Co.—SUNDAY THE REST FROM LABOUR: T. C. Newby.—Mrs H. BEECHER STOWE: J. S. Hodson.—TIME AND FAITH: Groombridge & Sons.—TUDOR: Macmillan & Co.—YOUNG; E. T. Whitfield.

tion during the last fifty years have resembled in kind, if not in number, those of the mother country. The New Englanders, and the people of the Western States colonized chiefly by them, have generally been supporters of the Puritan view, while the Quakers of Pennsylvania have taken the lead in maintaining that the Lord's Day is not the Sabbath. On the Sabbatarian side, by far the most notable champion is the late Dr TIMOTHY DWIGHT, President of Yale College, New Haven, Connecticut, and a grandson of Jonathan Edwards: he devotes to the subject five sermons, Nos. 105–9, comprised in his *Theology explained and defended* (Middletown, Conn. 1818; 5 vols. 8vo: Reprinted at London in 1819, 1822, 1824, 1827, 1828, and 1840).* At Cambridge, Massachusetts, Dr RUFUS WYMAN of Roxbury had previously published, in 1816, *Remarks on the Observance of the Lord's Day, as a Moral, a Positive, and a Civil Duty;* in which year appeared also at Boston, *Remarks on the Existing State of the Laws of Massachusetts respecting Violations of the Sabbath.*† On the other hand there were published at Philadelphia in 1822, *Essays on the Observance of the Sabb at*

* Dr Dwight is criticised by Fearon, pp. 183, 189; Domville, i. 127–132; and Cox, pp. 185, 516, 530. Dr Hessey, in his *Bampton Lectures*, p. 246, characterises him as "an author who, whatever be his excellences, certainly wrote in a superficial manner, and without much acquaintance with antiquity, on the Lord's Day."

† It deserves to be mentioned that an Act of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts "for the due observance of the Lord's Day," 8th March 1792, proceeds on a preamble of more than usual breadth of view:— "Whereas the observance of the Lord's Day is highly promotive of the welfare of a community, by affording necessary seasons for relaxation from labour and the cares of business; for moral reflections and conversation on the duties of life, and the frequent errors of human conduct; for the public and private worship of the Maker, Governor, and Judge of the world; and for those acts of charity which support and adorn a Christian society: and whereas some thoughtless and irreligious persons, inattentive to the duties and benefits of the Lord's Day, profane the same by unnecessarily pursuing their worldly business and recreations on that day, to their own great damage as members of a Christian society; to the great disturbance of well-disposed persons; and to the great damage of the community, by producing dissipation of manners and immoralities of life: Be it therefore enacted," &c. This law not only prohibits work and travelling (except in cases of necessity or charity), together with recreations and sports, but enacts that "whereas the public worship of Almighty God is esteemed by Christians an essential part of the due observance of the Lord's Day, and requires the greatest decency and reverence for the due performance of the same," any person not prevented by weakness of body or other sufficient cause, who shall be absent for three months from public worship shall pay a fine of ten shillings. The obvious impracticability of enforcing such a clause makes one suspect that it was inserted to please the stricter party, by legislators who in reality believed they were going altogether out of their province in doing so.

Down to 1853 it was unlawful in Massachusetts to be present at any game, sport, play, or public diversion, except concerts of sacred music, on the evening of *Saturday* as well as of Sunday.

(12mo, pp. 48), intended, as the writer explains, "to discountenance the superstitious observance of what evidently never was enjoined by Divine authority as a Christian ordinance; but without affording, on the other hand, any encouragement to the libertine to spend that or any other portion of time in an idle, wanton, or licentious manner."

Shortly before this time a wide-spread agitation against Sunday mails had arisen throughout the Union, and for the space of ten years petitions were presented in great abundance, but without effect, to the House of Representatives at Washington, praying for a legislative enactment to put an end to the transportation of mails, and the opening of post-offices, on the first day of the week. "These petitions," says Mr James Stuart in his *Three Years in North America*, "proceeded chiefly from the Presbyterians, who, it was observed, seemed to have forgotten that in the United States there is no national religion, and that the same principle which might lead to the prohibition of the transportation of mails on the Christian Sabbath might also extend the prohibition to the Jewish Sabbath." (Vol. ii. p. 16; 3d ed., Edin. 1833). At length a committee of the House was appointed to report on these petitions, Colonel R. M. Johnson of Kentucky being one of its members. Their Report, which was written by him, expressed opinions unfavourable to the petitioners, and received the approval of the House. From a copy of it given by Mr Stuart in the place referred to, the following passages are extracted:—

"The memorialists regard the first day of the week as a day set apart by the Creator for religious exercises, and consider the transportation of the mail, and the opening of the post-offices on that day, the violation of a religious duty, and call for a suppression of the practice. Others, by counter-memorials, are known to entertain a different sentiment, believing that no one day of the week is holier than another. Others, holding the universality and immutability of the Jewish decalogue, believe in the sanctity of the seventh day of the week as a day of religious devotion; and, by their memorial now before the Committee, they also request that it may be set apart for religious purposes. Each has hitherto been left to the exercise of his own opinion; and it has been regarded as the proper business of government to protect all, and determine for none. But the attempt is now made to bring about a greater uniformity, at least in practice; and, as argument has failed, the government has been called upon to interpose its authority to settle the controversy.

"Congress acts under a constitution of delegated and limited powers. The Committee look in vain to that instrument for a delegation of power, authorising this body to inquire and determine what part of time, or whether any, has been set apart by the Almighty for religious exercises. On the contrary, among the few prohibitions which it contains, is one that prohibits a religious test; and another, which declares that Congress shall pass no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free

exercise thereof. The Committee might here rest the argument upon the ground that the question referred to them does not come within the cognizance of Congress; but the perseverance and zeal with which the memorialists pursue their object seems to require further elucidation of the subject. . . .

"The law, as it now exists, makes no distinction as to the days of the week, but is imperative that the post-masters shall attend at all reasonable hours in every day to perform the duties of their offices; and the post-master-general has given his instructions to all post-masters, that, at post-offices where the mail arrives on Sunday, the office is to be kept open one hour or more after the arrival and assorting of the mail; but, in case that would interfere with the hours of public worship, the office is to be kept open for one hour after the usual time of dissolving the meeting. This liberal construction of the law does not satisfy the memorialists. But the Committee believe that there is not just ground of complaint, unless it be conceded that they have a controlling power over the consciences of others. If Congress shall, by the authority of the law, sanction the measure recommended, it would constitute a legislative decision of a religious controversy, in which even Christians themselves are at issue. However suited such a decision may be to an ecclesiastical council, it is incompatible with a republican legislature, which is purely for political, and not religious, purposes. . . .

"Why have the petitioners confined their prayer to the mails? Why have they not requested that the government be required to suspend all its executive functions on that day? Why do they not require us to exact that our ships shall not sail,—that our armies shall not march,—that officers of justice shall not seize the suspected, or guard the convicted? They seem to forget that government is as necessary on Sunday as on any other day of the week. It is the government, ever active in its functions, which enables us all, even the petitioners, to worship in our churches in peace. Our government furnishes very few blessings like our mails. They bear, from the centre of our republic to its distant extremes, the acts of our legislative bodies, the decisions of the justiciary, and the orders of the executive. Their speed is often essential to the defence of the country, the suppression of crime, and the dearest interests of the people. Were they suppressed one day of the week, their absence must often be supplied by public expresses, and, besides, while the mail-bags might rest, the mail-coaches would pursue their journey with the passengers. . . .

"It is the duty of this government to affirm to all,—to Jew or Gentile,—Pagan or Christian,—the protection and the advantages of our benignant institutions on Sunday, as well as every other day of the week.' Although this government will not convert itself into an ecclesiastical tribunal, it will practise upon the maxim laid down by the Founder of Christianity, that it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath day. If the Almighty had set apart the first day of the week as time which man is bound to keep holy, and devote

exclusively to his worship, would it not be more congenial to the prospects of Christians to appeal exclusively to the great Lawgiver of the universe to aid them in making men better,—in correcting their practices by purifying their hearts? Government will protect them in their efforts. When they shall so have instructed the public mind, and awakened the consciences of individuals as to make them believe that it is a violation of God's law to carry the mail, open post-offices, or receive letters on Sunday, the evil of which they complain will cease of itself, without any exertions of the strong arm of civil power."

These views were advocated in *The Christian Examiner* for May 1829 (vol. vi. p. 226), in an anonymous article known to have been written by the Rev. ORVILLE DEWEY; and more strongly in *The American Quarterly Review* for September 1830 (vol. viii. p. 175). On the same side came forth a pamphlet entitled *Sunday Mails; or Inquiries into the origin, institution, and proper mode of observance of the first day of the week, or Christian Sabbath* (Philad. 1830; 8vo, pp. 36). This contains a reprint, in very close type, of Higgins's *Horæ Sabbaticæ* (above, p. 332); part of the review of Bishop Kaye's Justin Martyr in *The British Critic* for January 1830 (above, p. 333); an Exposition of the Fourth Commandment, by Dr WILLIAM WHITE, Bishop of Pennsylvania, in his *Lectures on the Catechism;** and extracts from Paley and others. On the other hand, the Presbyterians in many places formed themselves into societies for promoting the observance of the Christian Sabbath, held numerous "conventions" with the same object, reprinted the volumes of Mr Macbeth and Bishop Wilson (above, pp. 330, 335), and produced, themselves, a series of works, of which the following are some:—*Essays on the Origin, Perpetuity, Change, and proper Observance of the Sabbath*, by HEMAN HUMPHREY, D.D., President of Amherst College, Massachusetts (New York, 1829; 24mo, pp. 107).—*Three Sermons on the Obligations, Duties, and Blessings of the Sabbath: To which are added, Remarks on the Report made to the House of Representatives of the United States, May 1830, on Sabbath Mails;* by CHARLES JENKINS, Pastor of the Third Congregational Church, Portland, Maine (Portland, 1830; 18mo, pp. 116).—*The North American Review*, No. 68; article on Sunday Mails (Boston, 1830).—*The Princeton Review*, 1831; article on Sabbath Observance, in reply to that on Sunday Mails in *The American Quarterly Review*. This article is reprinted in the first series of *Theological Essays from the Princeton Review*, of which there is an American edition, and also one published at Edinburgh in 1856, royal 8vo. The matters chiefly discussed are the mean-

* Dr Hessey, in his *Bampton Lectures*, p. 414, observes that Bishop White, in the *Lectures* above mentioned, p. 63, seq. "quite sees the difficulties in the way of allowing a patriarchal Sabbath. His testimony is useful, as showing that Dr Dwight's view is not universal in America. Bishop Seabury, of Connecticut, appears to agree very much with Dr Dwight. See his *Discourses on various Subjects*, Disc. vii. Obs. on History of the Sabbath, vol. i. p. 162. 1815."

ing of the phrase translated "keep holy" in the Fourth Commandment, the obligation of Christians to observe the Sabbath, and the powers of Congress in relation to that institution.—*A Manual of the Christian Sabbath*, by JOHN HOLMES AGNEW, Professor of Languages, Washington College, Washington, Pennsylvania; with an Introductory Essay by the Rev. S. MILLER, D.D. (Philad. 1832; 18mo, pp. 198).—*Addresses on the Christian Sabbath*, by the Rev. DANIEL O. MORTON (Windsor, Vermont, 1833; 12mo, pp. 132).—*The Child's Book on the Sabbath*, by the Rev. HORACE HOOKER (New York, 1835; 18mo, pp. 201).—*A Book for the Sabbath*, by J. B. WATERBURY (Andover, Mass., 1840; pp. 230); reprinted at London by the Religious Tract Society.—*The Sabbath*, by HENRY A. WORCESTER (Boston, 1840; 12mo, pp. 126).—*The Sabbath: A Brief History of Laws, Petitions, Remonstrances and Reports, with Facts and Arguments, relating to the Christian Sabbath*, by HARMON KINGSBURY (New York, 1840; post 8vo, pp. 391). Contents: I. History of Laws, Divine and Human, relating to the Sabbath: Law of God; Laws of States and Territories; Laws of Congress. II. Petitions and Remonstrances against Sunday Mails, accompanied with Committees' Reports, &c. (including Report by the Hon. Mr M'Creery, a member of Colonel Johnson's committee, in reply to the Report of the majority). Character and objects of these Memorialists. Memorials and Petitions in favour of Sunday Mails. Harmon Kingsbury's Petition against them, and Appendix. Executive Committee of the American Bethel Society. Congressional Sessions on Sunday. Governor Ellsworth. History of the Sabbath Union. III. Expediency of fearless and united effort. IV. Necessity for the Sabbath. V. Objections answered: 1. That there is no authority for the Sabbath; 2. That only the Jews are bound; 3. That the Ten Commandments have been abrogated; 4. That the New Testament does not require a Sabbath; 5. That there is no evidence that the day was changed; 6. That Deut. v. is opposed to Exod. xx.; 7. That this nation acknowledges no religion; 8. That works of public utility may be done on Sundays; 9. That Greece and Rome were as prosperous without as with religion; 10. That the Quakers are as moral without as with a Sabbath; 11. That literature is sufficient to secure morality; 12. That special judgments are not inflicted for national sins; 13. That Christians wish to unite Church and State; 14. That the framers of our government were sceptical; 15. That such sentiments will provoke persecution. VI. Appeal in behalf of the Sabbath. VII. Address to business men. VIII. Review of General Assembly's Report. IX. Address to Christians, patriots, and philanthropists.—*The Christian Examiner* for March 1841, vol. XXX. p. 92; article on the Sabbath, by the Rev. A. P. PEABODY (Boston, 1841).—*An Argument for the Perpetuity of the Sabbath*, by the Rev. A. A. PHELPS (Boston, 1841; 12mo, pp. 164).—*Proceedings of the Sabbath Convention held at the City of Rochester, July 20th and 21st*, 1842 (Rochester [N. Y.], 1842).—*A Mother's Plea for the Sabbath; in a Series of*

Letters to an absent Son, illustrated by Facts; by LUCY K. WELLS (Portland, 1843; 18mo, pp. 168).—*Proceedings of the State Sabbath Convention, held at Harrisburg on 30th and 31st May* 1844 (Philad. 1844).—*Report of Committee [of the Senate of the State of New York] on Canals, in Relation to the Observance of the Sabbath on the Canals, April* 10, 1844. The substance of this excellent Report is contained in the following resolution, which the committee recommended for the adoption of the Senate: "Resolved, that the continued violation of the laws by the opening of the locks on Sunday, and the performance of servile labour by the forwarders and other citizens, on the canals on that day, is not required by the public good, and that no further legislation is necessary."—*Proceedings of the New York State Sabbath Convention, held at Saratoga Springs, August* 28 *and* 29, 1844 (Albany, 1844).—*Lectures on the Institution of the Sabbath,* by JOHN S. STONE, D.D. (New York, 1844; 18mo, pp. 186). Criticised by Domville, ii. 258. Contents: 1. The Sabbath instituted at the Creation of Man. 2. Objections against its early institution considered. 3. Further proof of its early institution, and of its perpetual and universal obligation. 4. Argument for the change of the Sabbath to the first day of the week. 5. Duties of the Sabbath. 6. Benefits of the Sabbath, a motive to its sanctification. 7. Sinfulness of its violation. 8. Measures urged for the proper sanctification of the day.—*Historical Sketch of the Christian Sabbath,* by the Rev. LYMAN COLEMAN; in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for August 1844, vol. i. p. 526.—*Permanent-Sabbath Documents,* by JUSTIN EDWARDS, D.D. [of Andover, Massachusetts] (Philad. 1844; 18mo, pp. 54).—*The Sabbath Manual,* Nos. I.–IV., by JUSTIN EDWARDS, D.D. (New York, N. D.; 18mo, pp. 318). Dr Edwards was a travelling agitator on behalf of Sabbath-observance, and took a leading part in many "Conventions" in the different States. He was, and perhaps still is, the secretary of the American and Foreign Sabbath Union at Boston. The credulity and folly displayed in his collection of instances of God's judgments upon Sabbath-breakers excited the ridicule of his opponents. —*A Plea for the Sabbath, addressed to the Legal Profession in the United States,* by the Hon. WILLARD HALL, of Wilmington, Delaware (Baltimore, 1845; 8vo, pp. 12).—*Abstract of the Proceedings of the National Lord's Day Convention, held in the City of Baltimore on the 27th and 28th Nov.* 1844 (Baltimore, 1845; 8vo, pp. 82).—*The American Biblical Repository* for 1845, p. 366; article on the Sabbath, by the Rev. R. WEISER.—*Ancient Christianity exemplified in the private, domestic, social, and civil Life of the Primitive Christians, and in the original institutions, offices, ordinances, and rites of the Church,* by LYMAN COLEMAN, chap. XXVI. § 2, "Of the Christian Sabbath" (Philad. 1852; royal 8vo, pp. 645).—Article in *The Southern Presbyterian Review,* on the Sabbath Controversy, by Dr DABNEY, Professor of Theology in the Old School Union Seminary in Viginia; reprinted at London in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review,* No. 26, for Oct. 1858.—*The Obligation of the Sabbath; a Discussion between the Rev.* J. NEWTON BROWN *and* WILLIAM

B. TAYLOR (Philad. 1853; post 8vo, pp. 300). Sabbatarianism is here maintained by Mr Brown, and opposed by Mr Taylor.—*The Lord's Day, its Obligations and Blessings*, by WILLIAM B. STEVENS D.D., Rector of St Andrew's Church, Philadelphia (Philad. 1857; 12mo, pp. 48).—Article on Sunday Laws in *The Princeton Review*: reprinted in *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, No. 31, for Jan. 1860, the editor of which judges the article to be from the pen of Dr CHARLES HODGE, Professor of Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary at Princeton.—Article on *The Perpetual Observance of the Sabbath*, by Professor SMYTH of Bowdoin College, Maine, in *The American Theological Review* for April 1862.—*The Christian Sabbath, its History, Authority, Duties, Benefits, and Civil Relations; a Series of Discourses by the Rev.* N. L. RICE, D.D., WILLIAM HAGUE, D.D., HARVEY D. GANSE, WILLIAM ADAMS, D.D., *and* ALEX. H. VINTON, D.D.: *with a Sketch of the Sabbath Reform, by the Secretary of the New York Sabbath Committee* (New York, 1862).—Many tracts on the Sabbatarian side have been published by the American Tract Society, 150 Nassau Street, New York.

On the Dominical or anti-Puritan side, again, the chief recent works are—*The Sabbath*, by HENRY GREW (Philad. 1838; 12mo, pp. 24).—*History of the Institution of the Sabbath Day, its Uses and Abuses; with Notices of the Puritans, the Quakers, the National and other Sabbath Conventions, and of the Union between Church and State*, by WILLIAM LOGAN FISHER (Philad. 1845; 12mo, pp. 194: 2d ed. revised and enlarged, Philad. 1859; 12mo, pp. 248). Contents of 2d edition: "1. Preliminary observations. 2. Laws of Moses; the Sabbath an institution peculiar to the Jews, and observed by them as a day of rest and recreation. 3. Sabbath of the early Christians. 4. Sunday of Constantine. 5. Puritans of England, originators of the term 'Christian Sabbath.' 6. Puritans of New England. 7. The Quakers. 8. The spiritual element; doctrine of the inner light. 9. The Scripture; the Clergy. 10. The employment of chaplains; days of public thanksgiving; Sabbath Conventions. 11. Man cannot work unceasingly; closing courts no reason for closing railroads; all who hold according to reason, Christians; universality of the Christian religion; conclusion." This book is reviewed in the above-mentioned article ascribed to Dr Hodge.—*Proceedings of the Anti-Sabbath Convention, held in the Melodeon [at Boston], March 23d and 24th*, 1848: *Reported by* HENRY M. PARKHURST (Boston, 1848; 12mo, pp. 168).—*The Democratic Review* for Nov. 1848, vol. xxiii. p. 432; article on Sabbath Laws in Pennsylvania.—*Sunday Law neither Christian nor American*, by JOHN W. BROWNE; published by the Committee of the Anti-Sabbath Convention (Boston, 1849; 12mo, pp. 24).—*Sunday Occupations*, by CHARLES K. WHIPPLE (Boston, 1849; 12mo, pp. 60).—*Sunday Travel; a Discourse delivered in the First Congregational Unitarian Church in Philadelphia*, by W. H. FURNESS (Philad. 1850; 8vo, pp. 16; reprinted at London in 1857, for the National Sunday League).—*Some Thoughts on the most Christian Use of the Sunday;*

a Sermon preached at the Melodeon, Jan. 30, 1848; published in a volume of *Speeches, Addresses, and Occasional Sermons*, by THEODORE PARKER, minister of the 28th Congregational Church in Boston (Boston, 1852; post 8vo).

From Colonel Johnson's Report, quoted above, p. 412, we have seen that when the Presbyterians memorialised Congress against *Sunday* mails, the Seventh-day Baptists petitioned against the transportation and delivery of letters on *Saturday*. This sect, though small in proportion to the entire population of the States, is much more numerous than in England; it had in 1853 sixty-nine congregations in Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Illinois. It has missionary, educational, and tract societies; and publishes a newspaper in New York; where (at No. 9 Spruce Street) the central office of the sect is situated. In 1836 there was published at Schenectady, N. Y., a copious *Discussion of the original Institution, Perpetuity, and Change of the Weekly Sabbath, in a Series of Letters between* WILLIAM B. MAXSON, *Pastor of the Seventh-day Baptist Church in Piscataway, New Jersey, and* WILLIAM PARKINSON, *Pastor in the First-day Baptist Church in the City of New York* (18mo, pp. 324); and the opinions of the former have since been asserted and illustrated in a volume of *Tracts on the Sabbath*, published by the Tract Society last mentioned (New York, 1853; 18mo). This volume contains:—1. Reasons for introducing the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment to the consideration of the Christian public [by JABEZ CHADWICK]. 2. The Sabbath: its moral nature and observance [by J. B. BROWN]. 3. Authority for the change of the day examined [by JABEZ CHADWICK]. 4. The Sabbath and the Lord's-day; a history of their observance in the Christian Church [by WILLIAM B. MAXSON]. 5. A Christian Caveat to the Old and New Sabbatarians, by EDWARD FISHER (see above, vol. i. p. 237). 6. Twenty Reasons for keeping holy, in each week, the seventh day instead of the first day. 7. Thirty-six plain questions, presenting the main points in the Sabbath Controversy. A Dialogue between a Minister of the Gospel and a Sabbatarian. Counterfeit Coin. 8. The True Issue. 9. The Fourth Commandment; false exposition and its consequences. 10. The true Sabbath embraced and observed, by SAMUEL DAVIDSON, a convert to the observance of the seventh day. 11. Religious liberty endangered by legislative enactments: An appeal to the friends of equal rights and religious freedom in the United States, from the Seventh-day Baptist General Conference held in 1846. 12. Misuse of the term "Sabbath." 13. The Bible Sabbath, by WILLIAM M. FAHNESTOCK, M.D. 14. Delaying obedience. 15. An appeal for the restoration of the Bible Sabbath; in an address to the Baptists, from the Seventh-day Baptist General Conference. 16. The Royal Law contended for, by EDWARD STENNET (see above, vol. i. p. 267). 17. Vindication of the true Sabbath, in two parts: (1.) Narrative of recent events; (2.) Divine appointment of the seventh day; by J. W. MORTON, late mis-

sionary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.—The biography, history, and statistics of this sect in America are recorded in a quarterly magazine, entitled *The Seventh-Day Baptist Memorial*, 3 vols. 8vo, with portraits of ministers, and views of meeting-houses (New York, 1852-4). Rupp's *History of Religious Denominations in the United States* contains a "History of the Seventh-Day Baptists," by W. B. GILLETT, and an article on "the German Seventh-Day Baptists," by W. M. FAHNESTOCK. There is also a comprehensive *General History of the Sabbatarian Churches; embracing accounts of the Armenian, East Indian, and Abyssinian Episcopacies in Asia and Africa, the Waldenses, Semi-Judaisers, and Sabbatarian Anabaptists in Europe, with the Seventh-Day Baptist Denomination in the United States*, by Mrs TAMAR DAVIS (Philad. 1851; cr. 8vo, pp. 255). In her preface she says: "The Seventh-Day Baptists have, from the first, contended that the Sabbath was changed, not by Christ or his apostles, but by ecclesiastical synods and councils. This could only be proved convincingly by reference to the practice of those churches who were removed by distance or otherwise beyond the pale of such authority. That the Armenian, East Indian, and Abyssinian Episcopacies were so removed, and that they absolutely refused to succumb to the authority of the Latin or Greek prelates, sustaining in consequence the most cruel and desolating wars, is an undeniable historical fact; no less so the truth that during all this time they have been living witnesses against Anti-Christ, as the observers of the ancient Sabbath, which practice they learned from the apostles or their immediate successors." The assertion in the last clause of this passage is, I hardly need say, without a shadow of proof or probability. (See above, i. 343, note.)

In 1837 or 1838, the Legislature of New York was petitioned by a number of persons who seem to have regarded the sabbatical observance of Sunday as not only no Christian duty, but politically inexpedient, and the laws enforcing that observance as inconsistent with the Constitution of the State and with the rights of man. But their prayer for the repeal of all such laws was rejected on grounds stated in the following able "Report of the Committee on the Judiciary," on the petition, dated 13th March 1838:—

"Your committee do not apprehend any of the evils which the petitioners suggest as likely to follow from the observance of the Sabbath. There is nothing in the history of the past, or in the prospect of the future, which induces the belief that the laws on this subject will 'promote indolence,' or 'increase the opportunities and facilities to vice and immorality.' Viewing the Sabbath merely as a civil institution, venerable from its age, consecrated as a day of rest by the usage of our fathers, cherished by the common consent of mankind throughout the nations of Christendom, we cannot concur with the petitioners in regarding the laws for its observance as 'glaring outrages,' nor participate in the 'profound astonishment' with which they profess to be 'filled' by

reason of the 'toleration of those laws in the present age.' The petitioners may safely dismiss their fear that the influence of the Sabbath will be corrupting to the public morals; they need have no anxiety lest our citizens should cease to be an industrious people, because of their resting one day in seven: they may feel assured that 'liberty and equality' are in no danger of being subverted by the regulated observance of a day which witnesses, throughout this Commonwealth, 'the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference.' (*Constitution*, article 7, section 3.) They will find, if they examine the subject, that the great end of our Government is to secure, protect, and perpetuate both civil and religious liberty, and that the Legislature has no more power to violate those rights, by treating churches and religious associations as 'public nuisances,' than it has to treat literary societies or political meetings in the same light.

"When the people of this State adopted the Constitution under which we live, they ordained that 'the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall be for ever allowed in this State to all mankind; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the State.' (*Constitution*, article 7, section 3.) But in thus protecting themselves against the intolerance of any one religious sect, it was by no means their object to declare war against religion itself. On the contrary, they expressly provided that even this freedom of conscience, which is thus secured as sacred, shall in no case permit any acts which are licentious, and, therefore, inconsistent with that public morality which has the Christian religion alone for its basis and support.

"In all countries some kind of religion or other has existed in all ages. No people on the face of the globe are without a prevailing national religion. Magistrates have sought in many countries to strengthen civil government by an alliance with some particular religion, and an intolerant exclusion of all others. But those who have wielded this formidable power have rendered it a rival, instead of an auxiliary to the public welfare; a fetter, instead of a protection to the rights of conscience. With us it is wisely ordered, that no one religion shall be established by law, but that all persons shall be left free in their choice and in their mode of worship. Still, *this is a Christian nation.* Ninety-nine hundredths, if not a larger proportion of our whole population, believe in the general doctrines of the Christian religion. Our Government depends for its very being on the virtue of the people; on that virtue which has its foundation in the morality of the Christian religion: and that religion is the common and prevailing faith of the people. There are, it is true, exceptions to this belief, but general laws are not made for excepted cases. There are to be found, here and there, the world over, individuals who entertain opinions hostile to the common sense of mankind on subjects

of honesty, humanity, and decency; but it would be a kind of republicanism with which we are not acquainted in this country, which would require the great mass of mankind to yield to, and be governed by, this few.

"It is quite unnecessary to enter into a detailed review of all the evidence that Christianity is the common creed of this nation; we know it, and we feel it, as we know and feel any other unquestioned and admitted truth; the evidence is all around us, and before us, and with us. We know, too, that the exceptions to this general belief are rare; so very rare that they are sufficient only, like other exceptions, to prove a general rule.

"Such being the case, the question arises, whether the laws and usages required by the principles and feelings of the vast majority should give way to the peculiar dogmas of the very few; whether they are oppressive on the conscience; or whether they operate as a greater restriction on the natural rights of the very few than is indispensable to the good of society.

"It is obvious that a negative is the only answer that can be given to either of these inquiries. Our laws are entirely tolerant; they recognise no tests, disabilities, or discriminations; there is no impediment to the free enjoyment, by every human being, of any religion whatever; there is no proscription of those who do or do not belong to any particular sect, or to no sect, who believe in any particular religion, or no religion; all are alike protected by the laws and amenable to them. The desecration of the Sabbath by servile labour, sporting, gaming, hunting, and horse-racing, would, in a state of society like ours, be an outrage on the feelings and peace of the people, and would be incompatible with the 'exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship' guaranteed to them by the Constitution. Such acts, therefore, become positive offences, and are prohibited by law; and such prohibition is no more a restraint of the natural rights of the solitary few, than hundreds of others in the statute book, or than is due to the social rights of the community as a whole.

"Your committee desire to be understood as placing these laws exclusively on the ground of political and constitutional right. With the religious obligations which individuals are under to reverence the Sabbath, we have nothing to do; those obligations are purely personal, not social; as to them, every man is, of right, his own judge. Aside from usual considerations under which the people of this country are disposed to observe the Sabbath, there can be no question that, as a mere civil institution, none could be devised more salutary. If it had no other effect than to promote the personal cleanliness and cessation from bodily labour, so essential to the health and physical energy of a population, it would be well worth legal protection. The experience of mankind has shewn that occasional rest is necessary for the health of the labourer, and for his continued ability to toil: that 'the interval of relaxation which Sunday affords to the laborious part of mankind, contributes greatly to the comfort and satisfaction of their

lives, both as it refreshes them for the time, and as it relieves their six days' labour by the prospect of a day of rest always approaching, which could not be said of casual indulgence of leisure and rest, even were they more frequent than there is reason to expect they would be if left to the discretion or humanity of interested taskmasters.' (Paley, vol. iii. p. 292.*) In the absence of laws prohibiting labour on the Sabbath, all that portion of the people who are in the service of others, who are employed as clerks, apprentices, in manufactories, as labourers, and otherwise, would be without any protection for their rights of worship or of rest; they would be left at the mercy of others, and subject to the caprice, cupidity, or legalised immorality of their employers. The added toil of the seventh day would only reduce the price, and the 'labourer himself, who deserved and suffered most by the change, would gain nothing.' Even the beasts that toil for man are entitled to their rest, and it is found that they can accomplish more by ceasing from their work one day in seven. Thus the dictates of humanity and the decree of nature alike require the observance of the Sabbath.

"If the laws forbidding labour of one kind were repealed, there would be no reason why the repeal should not extend to all kinds; why courts should not sit; process issue; jurors be compelled to serve, and parties and witnesses attend on the Sabbath; why the militia should not be ordered out for parade and inspection; why town meetings should not be held; in a word, there should be no reason why the people should not be at all times liable to be interrupted in the conscientious discharge of their religious duties, and to a virtual prohibition of the 'free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship.'

"The humanising effect of the Sabbath in promoting works of benevolence, charity, schools for the instruction of those who cannot obtain instruction elsewhere, and in strengthening the social relations of friends and neighbours, is among its most benign results. The principles which are then inculcated, in churches of all denominations, strengthen that public morality, good order, and obedience to the laws, so essential to the security of the State.

"A black chapter in the history of the French revolution furnishes a monitory lesson as to the results of the prostration of all religion. There is nothing in those countries where the Sabbath is disregarded to commend their example to our imitation. We are persuaded that the petitioners would not, as good citizens, be willing to see cock-fighting, horse-racing, theatrical exhibitions, bull-baiting, and other demoralising and brutal displays, take the place of the quiet and order, the tranquillity and peace, which reign throughout our borders on that day. And yet, if we abandon our customs, and break down those barriers against vice, which now protect us, there is no reason to suppose that we should

* See above, p. 249.

not be visited by those offensive results as well as other countries. We need hardly say, that while public virtue and morality prevail in this State, the people will never ratify, by a repeal of the law, the violation of the Sabbath. It is endeared to them by the example of their fathers, by the associations of their youth, and by the habit of their lives." (Quoted by Kingsbury, pp. 108–113.)

That these reasons did not satisfy all who concurred with the petitioners, appears from the proceedings of the "Anti-Sabbath Convention" held at Boston in 1848. The summoners of that Convention, however, professed themselves to be hostile, not to the voluntary practice of resting on the Sunday, but only to civil laws compelling men to do so. "We have no objection," they declared, "either to the first or the seventh day of the week *as a day of rest from bodily toil*, both for man and beast. On the contrary, *such rest is not only desirable, but indispensable.* Neither man nor beast can long endure unmitigated labour. But we do not believe that it is in harmony with the will of God, or the physical nature of man, that mankind should be doomed to hard and wasting toil six days out of seven to obtain a bare subsistence. Reduced to such a pitiable condition, the rest of one day in the week is indeed grateful, and must be regarded as a blessing; but it is wholly inadequate to repair the physical injury or the moral degradation consequent on such protracted labour. It is not in accordance with the law of life that our race should be thus worked, and only thus partially relieved from suffering and a premature death. *They need more,* AND MUST HAVE MORE, *instead of less rest;* and it is only for them to be enlightened and reclaimed—to put away those things which now cause them to grind in the prison-house of Toil—namely, idolatry, priestcraft, sectarism, slavery, war, intemperance, licentiousness, monopoly, and the like—in short, to live IN PEACE, obey the eternal law of being, strive for each other's welfare, and 'glorify God in their bodies and spirits which are his'—and they will secure the rest, not only of one day in seven, but of a very large portion of their earthly existence. To them shall be granted the mastery over every day and every hour of time, as against want and affliction; for the earth shall be filled with abundance for all.

"Nor do we deny the right of any number of persons to observe a particular day of the week as holy time, by such religious rites and ceremonies as they may deem acceptable to God. To their own master they stand or fall. In regard to all such matters, it is for every one to be fully persuaded in his own mind, and to obey the promptings of his own conscience, conceding to others the liberty he claims for himself.

"The sole and distinct issue that we make is this:—We maintain that the seventh-day Sabbath was exclusively Jewish in its origin and design; that no holiness, in any sense, attaches to the first day of the week, more than to any other; and that the attempt to compel the observance of any day as 'THE SABBATH,' especially by penal enactments, is unauthorised by Scripture or

reason, and a shameful act of imposture and tyranny. We claim for ourselves, and for all mankind, the right to worship God according to the dictates of OUR OWN CONSCIENCES. This right, inherent and inalienable, is cloven down in the United States; and we call upon all who desire to preserve civil and religious liberty to rally for its rescue.

"By that infallible test of conscious rectitude which Jesus gave to his disciples,—'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them,'—let those who sabbatise on the first day of the week be measured. At present, they constitute the majority, we the minority, in this country; hence the legislative power is in their hands, which they do not scruple to use for the purpose of binding and coercing our consciences. Now, let the case be reversed. Suppose this power were in the hands of those who do not sabbatise, and they should proceed to enact penal laws, forbidding the observance of any day as the Sabbath, would not the Sabbatarians cry out against such laws as vexatious and tyrannical, destructive of the rights of conscience, and a disgrace to the statute book?

"We are aware that we shall inevitably be accused by the chief priests, scribes, and Pharisees of the present time, as was Jesus by the same class in his age, as 'not of God,' because we 'do not keep the Sabbath day;' but we are persuaded, that to expose the popular delusion which prevails on this subject is *to advance the cause of a pure Christianity, to promote true and acceptable worship, and to inculcate strict moral and religious accountability, in all the concerns of life,* ON ALL DAYS OF THE WEEK ALIKE." (*Proceedings*, pp. 6–8.)

The italics and capitals are in the original of this and the following extracts.

Messrs William L. Garrison, C. C. Burleigh, John W. Browne, and Henry C. Wright, and Mrs Lucretia Mott, were the chief supporters of the proposal to abolish Sabbath laws; while Theodore Parker advocated their continuance in a milder state, on the ground of the utility of a weekly day of rest. He said—"It is commonly supposed that our New England notion respecting Sunday is a very old notion; but it seems to me that that is a very great mistake. I know it is a mistake; and experience, I think, has shown that it is a sad mistake. I do not find that any considerable number of persons ever entertained our New England notions until less than 300 years ago. About the year 1595, Dr Bound, an English Puritan, wrote a book respecting the Sabbath, in which he claimed that the Hebrew Sabbath was of divine origin, but maintained that, after the resurrection, the Sabbath, and all the laws respecting the Sabbath, were miraculously transferred to the first day of the week. Therefore, all Christians were bound to observe the first day of the week, just as the Jews were bound to observe their Sabbath. That was regarded by intelligent Churchmen—as it was—as a very great heresy in the church. Religious men said it was a *heresy*, and they said right,

because it was an innovation, and there was nothing to warrant it. Political men said it was an *absurdity*, and it was an absurdity. The book was written in the days of fanaticism, when the public were rising against the abominations, and frivolity, and wickedness of the Roman church. Now, the Roman church had not made the best use of the Sunday, by any means. It did not offer enough instruction; it had too much for the senses, as some think. But be that as it may, *it had too little for the soul*, as it seems to me. Men commonly think they are never clear of one wrong till they have got the opposite wrong. So the Puritans, disgusted with the frivolity which they saw in the Romish church—disappointed at finding in the Catholic Sunday, in its freedom and its frolic, so little for the direct nurture of religion—went over to the other extreme, and made Sunday—we all know what they made of the Sunday. That was a time of fanatical reaction against old abuses. Dr Bound, in his book, represented the fanatical reaction. There is no great danger of resisting a wrong too powerfully, but there is great danger of going over to the opposite wrong, and contending that that wrong is the right. It seems as if it would have been easy to settle down upon the Christian idea of the Sunday at that time, and avoid the error of the Catholics, without committing a new error. But the Puritans did not do so; they did commit a new error, and we are met here to-day to correct that error. I would not commit the same fault that the Puritans did, and go to the opposite extreme. If men are fanatical in their notion of keeping the Sunday, I would not be a fanatic and destroy it; for if men now are driven by the spirit of reaction against the Puritanic idea of the Sunday, and go to the opposite extreme, why, all the work must be done over again till it is well done.

"But I am wandering a little from what I wish to say now. Half a century before Dr Bound's time, in the reign of Edward VI., it was found necessary to enact laws for the better observance of *Lent* and other periods of fasting. A statute was made in the year 1548 to prohibit the eating of flesh on those days; the reason of the statute is given—not because fasting is enjoined in the Old Testament, but because '*due and godly abstinence is a mean to virtue*,' and that 'fishers *may thereby be set at work, and much flesh shall be saved and increased*.' (2d and 3d Edward VI. c. 19). The statute was revived in the next reign; but to guard against the notion that fasting or eating fish is a virtue in itself, and 'because no manner of person shall misjudge of the intent of this statute,' it is enacted, 'that *whosoever shall notify that any eating of fish or forbearing of flesh mentioned therein is of any necessity for the saving of the soul of man, or that it is the service of God, otherwise than as other politic laws are and be; then such persons shall be punished as spreaders of false news*.' (5th Eliz. c. 5, §§ 18, 39, 40, in Hallam.)

"Now, if the laws respecting the Sabbath were enacted by the British Parliament in the beginning of the seventeenth century, and if the laws of New England and the United States had had

such a preamble as that, stating that it was for the public good and for political considerations that they were passed, and not for religious considerations, then we should have been freed from a monstrous amount of abuse, and a deal of tyranny. It seems to me that the history of the Christian church has shown that it is useful to stop, and lay aside common work, and devote one day to rest, to society, to man's spiritual culture; and by spiritual culture, I mean his religious, moral, and intellectual culture—in short, the cultivation of his whole spiritual nature. It seems to me that it is useful to do this now. But I will not dwell upon that point. A clergyman is not a proper person to testify on that point. I love the Sunday, and I love my profession; but lest I should be unduly biassed in that matter, I will say no more respecting it now.

"This I will say, that if even it is a religious duty to separate one day from common purposes, and devote it to religious purposes, it seems to me that the *law* need not trouble itself much about it. I cannot think it is right and Christian, by means of pains and penalties, to force men to abstain from inoffensive and innocent work, or from inoffensive and innocent sport, even on Sunday. By *innocent*, I mean *that which is not wrong in itself;* and by *inoffensive*, I mean *that which does not disturb other men.* It might be right for the Legislature to pass a decree that certain kinds of work should not be done on Sunday, if they would annoy the greater part of the people of the Commonwealth. If such a law is made, I should hope it might be made in the same spirit in which the laws command travellers to keep to the right, and not by any means to tyrannise over men's consciences. One thing, it seems to me, the Legislature has entirely in its power. Here are many Manufacturing Companies, having in their employment large numbers of men and women; the Legislature has created these Companies. It may, therefore, make laws, telling them when to shut down their gates, and stop their mills—thus forbidding them to tyrannise over mankind, by forcing operatives to work on Sunday against their wishes, if such a disposition should ever exist. It may be necessary to do that, or unnecessary.

"It is sometimes said that the present prevalent notions respecting Sunday, notwithstanding they are untrue, superstitious, and unchristian, are yet 'safe,' and therefore it is very improper to come forward and oppose them. Therefore this Convention is likely to be a very *wicked* Convention, although it should say nothing but what is true. I heard a man say that if he had the whole of God Almighty's truth shut up in his left hand, he would not allow a man to unlock even his little finger. That is not my creed at all. I do not believe mankind is in the least danger of being ruined by an *excess of truth.* I have that confidence in truth, that I fear it not under any circumstances; but I do fear error, whether coming from churches, states, or majorities, or minorities, in the world.

"This untrue doctrine has already not only deprived us of a great many advantages which we might receive on Sunday, but has brought numerous positive and dreadful evils upon us. In the first place, it has prevented the proper use of the Sunday. It has taught us to observe the Sunday, not for itself, but as a duty—to keep it from *fear*, and not from *love*. It has made it a day, stern, dark, and disagreeable, to at least one-half of the people of this land.

"Out of this notion, in the next place, there has grown this idea, that while for common offences God allows the natural laws of the universe to keep the even tenor of their way; while He sends no lightning to fall upon the man who steals, or who commits murder or the foulest crimes, yet for the purpose of punishing those who break the Sabbath, He works miracles; He overturns boats on the waters, strikes barns with lightning, and throws men from the tops of their hay-ricks; and thus overturns the laws of nature for the purpose of punishing the man who does what he might have done with a good conscience on Saturday or Monday. That notion has been sedulously promoted among the people. I know not the men engaged in this work. Some of them, I doubt not, are good men and honest men. It is not for me to sit in judgment upon them. I will suppose they have walked by their light. I will not judge the men, but I will judge of their light by the manner of their walking.

"Again, this popular notion about the Sunday works badly, by preventing reform meetings. It was my lot to pass ten years of my life in a little village not ten miles from Boston, where there was an Orthodox meeting. I think that minister sincere, as I am sincere; but no Temperance meeting, Peace meeting, or Anti-Slavery meeting, could be held in his church; not a marriage or a funeral could take place on Sunday. He could not hinder men from dying on that day, but he would hinder them from being buried. Now, all reforms find this a great obstacle in their way. Sunday is a leisure day. It is a day when it is thought wicked to read any secular book. It may be the best book that ever was written, but it is wrong to read it on Sunday. But the people don't think it is wicked to meet together in a church, and hear what is told them there. Sunday, therefore, would afford the very best opportunity for the reformer to do his work. . . . .

"That is not all. The tendency is to make religion merely ceremonial. Some of the resolutions speak of it as such. I think a great deal of the ceremoniousness and sanctimoniousness of our religion has come from this idea; and, accordingly, we have seen this phenomenon presented constantly in a thousand shapes before us, of men so exceedingly scrupulous about the first day of the week, and so exceedingly unscrupulous on every other day. The moment we abolish *the superstition* connected with this, the moment we view the Sunday as Paul viewed it, and as all the Gentile Christians viewed it, as a day like other days, which it is expedient to devote to religious purposes, then all this host of evils

stops at once, for the superstition I have mentioned is the mother of all these abominations.

"It is no part of my plan 'to give up the Sunday,' to devote the day to business, to mere idleness, to mere amusement. I should be sorry to see it thus spent. We shall always have *work* enough in New England; and if Moses were to legislate for us, I think he would sooner have two rest days in the week than abandon one. I would turn the Sunday into a day of rest for the body—a day devoted to rest—to religious, moral, and intellectual culture, to social intercourse—a day of freedom, not of bondage; still less a day of riot and license. I would shun the superstitions which now rob us of half the blessings of the Sunday, but would not, as our Puritan fathers, go from one wrong to another wrong. I would not keep the Sunday like a fanatic; I would not, like a fanatic, destroy it.

"I have a series of Resolutions which I will read and lay on the table. They differ somewhat from those of my friend Mr Browne, which have been already laid before you.

"*Resolved*, 1st, That it is not our design to 'give up the Sunday'—to prevent or diminish the voluntary devotion of that day to rest, and to special efforts for the spiritual culture of man; but, on the contrary, it is our deliberate purpose yet farther to promote such an observance of the day, but without resorting to superstition or the force of public law to insure it.

"2d, That though we recognise all days as equally holy in themselves, and recognise the duty of keeping every day blameless and holy, by living a manly and religious life, we yet learn from history and from observation, that the custom of devoting one day in the week mainly to rest from common work, and to the various purposes of spiritual culture, has produced many happy results, and that it is still important to the greater part of mankind.

"3d, That we desire to remove all obstacles which now hinder men from making the most profitable and Christian use of the Sunday.

"4th, That we consider the common opinions concerning the origin of the Sabbath, and of the sabbatical observance of Sunday, as also respecting the nature of that day itself, as untrue, as superstitious, hostile to the Christian spirit, and full of danger to the religious interests of mankind; that these unchristian and superstitious opinions form one of the chief obstacles to the yet more profitable use of the Sunday.

"5th, That while we lament the prevalence of such opinions, and consider them as dangerous, we should also lament at seeing the Sunday devoted to common work or amusements—not as if we shared the common and erroneous opinions concerning the Sunday—not as if we thought it wicked to labour or sport on that day,—but because we think it may be devoted to a higher and a better purpose.

"6th, That we lament the attempts made and making to

render the Sunday more Jewish in its character, thus attempting to lay a yoke on us which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear.

"7th, That we consider Sunday a fit and proper time as any other day of the week to meet and discuss the sins of the people, such as War, Slavery, Intemperance, and the like—and also to take measures to prevent and exterminate these evils.

"8th, That while we admit the Legislature has the right to make laws concerning the operations of manufacturing and other corporations which it has called into existence on Sundays as on other days—and also to insure justice between the employer and employed—we deny that it has any moral right to legislate for the conscience of private men, by telling them when they shall worship God.

"9th, That we recommend the repeal of all laws which decree penalties against private persons for the pursuit of innocent and inoffensive callings on the Sunday." (*Proceedings*, pp. 43–50.)

By the majority of those present when the vote was taken (mostly Quakers, it would seem), only the 4th, 6th, 7th, and 9th of these resolutions were accepted. The middle course proposed by Mr Parker was rejected as too apt to countenance the notion, if not that days are holy, at least that it is best to have one day in seven set apart for religious purposes. "Is not the Convention," said Lucretia Mott, "prepared to go farther than this? to dissent from this idea, and declare openly that it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath day? That it is the consecration of all our time to God and to goodness, that is required of us? Not by demure piety; not by avoiding innocent recreation on any day of the week; but by such a distribution of time as shall give sufficient opportunity for such intellectual culture and spiritual improvement, as our mental and religious nature requires. There would not then be the necessity of a devotion of the seventh part of our time, even for the rational improvement that our friend yesterday considered so essential. . . . Some of the resolutions offered by Theodore Parker do not appear in accordance with the resolutions already passed here; and the tendency of them, I fear, would be rather to strengthen the superstition that prevails on this subject than to lessen it. The object of this Convention is to remove this superstition, as well as to take measures for the repeal of all penal enactments to enforce the observance of the day. So far, its course has been in accordance with its object, as published to the world. It is important that we should carry out consistently our principles and proposed measures." (Pp. 95, 126.) Had Mr Parker been present at this meeting, he perhaps would have replied, that if utility were habitually and plainly set forth as the sole ground of the sabbatical observance of Sunday, there would be little danger of encouraging superstitious views of the observance; that the only *practicable* mode of securing rest to the busy multitude is by preserving the well-established institution which exists; that unless the nation agreed to rest from labour

and traffic at one and the same time, the proposed independent arrangements of individuals would be constantly thwarted by those of other persons acting under theirs; and that unless a portion of the week so well defined by nature as a day were set apart for repose, the most serious encroachments on it would be inevitable,—and besides, it would be impossible for most men to experience that tranquillity and freedom from care to which the leisure of a whole day is so favourable.

Most of the speakers ridiculed the assertion of Dr Justin Edwards, that God's supernatural judgments (of which the Puritans said so much in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as noticed above, i. 140, 149, 187, 191, 266, and ii. 16) fall largely on Sabbath-breakers. "I would set the example to children," said one, "of doing on Sunday what I do on other days. If I make hay on Saturday, I make it on Sunday. I may be tired, and glad to rest; but my neighbours do not make it on Sunday, and I feel it my duty to do it. When my neighbours get so that they are not afraid to make hay on Sunday, and then choose to meet together, I may be glad to meet with them. I wish to show that I can do this, and yet live. My barns have not yet been burned, although there is considerable hay in them that was got in on Sunday. You may tell Dr Edwards that a man can do this, and not be struck with lightning. I have got them insured, but the Insurance Company seemed not to be entire converts to this faith; for they did not charge me any extra percentage that I know of. I am inclined to think that this doctrine of Dr Edwards is not gaining ground, although I have no doubt that he is exerting himself to the utmost. I think the best teacher is example. So long as the community think it to be wrong to work on Sunday, I shall feel it my duty to work on Sunday. But when it shall be generally understood that there is no distinction in days, then, if convenient, I shall be very glad to lay work aside. I don't like the idea of working seven days in the week. A man who will work half the time ought to have a good living. But I do think, in the present state of society, we can preach most effectually, especially to children and youth, by going about our ordinary employments. If you don't like to work all day, work half the day, and be sure to work where you will be seen. Show them that you can work on Sunday, and yet not cheat on Monday. I think the good sense of this community will be satisfied that it is better to work on Sunday, and be honest all the time, than to keep the Sunday, and lie, cheat, and steal the remaining six days of the week." (P. 82, *Speech of Parker Pillsbury.*) Another speaker, Stephen S. Foster, said that when a boy he was long afraid to bathe on Sunday, because his mother told him of the many instances of drowning on that day; and when at last he ventured into the water he was in real danger of losing his life, "because," said he, "such was the effect of superstition upon my mind, that I had not the absolute control of my limbs, and it was not until many attempts that I ventured out into the deep." (P. 79.) To which

Mr Pillsbury added,—"No doubt there are more accidents in proportion on the Sabbath. You are cowards; you expect to be drowned, and therefore you are drowned; your cowardice is the occasion of it. God don't go about drowning folks on Sunday. Go into the water, cool, calm, and composed, and you come out safe. Go trembling, and expecting that God is upon your track to drown you, and you will probably be drowned. If you sincerely believe you ought to keep the Sabbath, go and keep it. I hold you responsible; you are a Sabbath-breaker if you do not. But I am not to be judged by your conscience. I hold you to the doctrine of the New Testament—'Whatsoever is not of faith is sin; and he that doubts is damned;' and you damn yourselves by your doubts." (P. 86.)

Mrs Mott characterised the threats of God's judgments on Sabbath-breakers as "unworthy the age, when we have such works as Combe on the Constitution of Man so freely circulated, shewing the true workings of the natural laws and their unavoidable results" (p. 130). But in justice to the clerical advocates of the Sabbath in the United States it must be stated that they are not all so superstitious as Dr Edwards. Dr William Adams, pastor of the Madison-Square Presbyterian Church in New York, has lately treated the subject in the following rational way:—"It is worthy of our profound and earnest thought, how much less of evil there would be in the world, if there were a more careful attention to those physical laws which have been ordained by the same Being who appointed the Sabbath. If God has designed that this natural mechanism cannot run incessantly without friction, and wear, and waste; if he has required this clang and clatter to stop awhile for rest and lubrication, then is it certain that the attempt to work it beyond the prescribed limits will be followed by irritability, and petulance, and evil passions, and insanity. When Sir Matthew Hale made the remark, which has now become classical, that he invariably observed that he prospered during the week according to the degree of fidelity with which he observed the Sabbath, it was not the irrational suggestion of superstition, but a fact founded on natural laws. Who can doubt that the judgment of that distinguished jurist was the more sound; his discernment of affairs more clear; his whole personality more vigorous and available, after the repose of the Sabbath, than it could have been had his brain been kept under full tension and excitement through seven days of unintermitted labour? Lord Castlereagh adopted another practice, which resulted in another way. His overwrought nature, hampered and annoyed by the meshes of political casuistry, day after day, and week after week, without a Sabbath, broke down under the strain, and he died in the delirium of insanity by his own hand. I draw my illustrations, of purpose, from this class of working men, rather than from those who work only by strength of muscle or nicety of mere manual skill, because it is more suited to an audience like this, composed of men who work with the brain, in the counting-room, at the bar, on the bench, than to one

made up of those who drudge with sledge and spade. If the induction of facts should confirm what has been reported, that accidents have been most frequent and ruinous upon those railroads on which work is compelled for the seven days alike, instead of disposing of it, as some pretend, as a mere whim, we should be prompt to assert that an engineer whose hand is on the lever of a locomotive every day, without that intermission which God has ordained, would be likely to impair that coolness of judgment, quickness of apprehension, and steadiness of nerve, which are necessary to the safety of the property and lives under his care, so that disaster would be the likeliest of all occurrences. The point which we make is, that He who ordained the law of the Sabbath is the Maker of the human frame; that this law is not an arbitrary appointment, but essential to human welfare; that it cannot be violated without inflicting harm on the constitution which it was designed to bless; that expediency and prudence, though they do not proceed from the same point with duty, invariably tend to the same result; in short, that our Christian Sabbatism is a law of relief and of compensation, and any arrest put upon it is adding force and volume to that intensity of labour, which stunts the unthinking down into coarsest animalism, and precipitates those who think incessantly in one strain into exhaustion, madness, and death."—(*The Christian Sabbath*, pp. 206–9, New York, 1862).*

It has already appeared (pp. 412–421) that in the United States

* It is creditable to Dr Samuel Wright that, early in the 18th century, he wrote in similar terms. (See above, p. 168.) The passage quoted from Hale occurs in his *Contemplations*, p. 480 (Lond. 1676).

Heylin in one place agrees with Ironside (above, i. 191) in denying that the sins for which Divine judgments are inflicted can be authoritatively declared by ignorant mortals. After mentioning that on the occasion of a great destruction of men and houses in Limoges on a Sunday in the sixth century, owing to a flash of lightning or some other cause, Gregory of Tours pronounced the calamity to have fallen on the citizens *ob diei dominici injuriam*—because some of them used to work upon the Lord's-day,—he asks, "But how could he tell that; or who made him acquainted with God's secret counsels?" (*Hist. of the Sabbath*, Part II. ch. iv. § 6.) Bishop White is not so bold; he does not question that the offence for which a calamity not naturally related to it is endured can be known, but only doubts whether Sabbatarian opinions are thereby more confirmed than Dominical. "God's vengeance upon malicious profaners of the Lord's-day," says he, "is no sufficient argument to prove that this day is expressly or literally commanded to be observed in the Christian Church by the particular precept of the Fourth Commandment. For wilful transgression of the precepts of the Church, commanding such actions and offices as are religious, holy, and subservient to God's glory, brings God's heavy judgments upon profane and disobedient people." (*Examination of a Lawless Pamphlet, &c.* p. 77.) Heylin also, in treating of a case in which some French husbandmen in the 9th century were killed by lightning while at work on a Sunday in defiance of a civil law which at that time existed against it, conceives that God smote them, not in relation to the day, but to their disobedience to the powers that were. (Part II. ch. v. § 7.) In the beginning of the

the constitutionality of laws prohibiting work on Sunday has been largely discussed. In Pennsylvania and South Carolina the tribunals have had occasion to consider this point in the cases of Jews and Seventh-day Baptists accused of working or trading on that day. (See case of Abraham Wolf, 9th Jan. 1817, in Sargeant and Rawle's *Reports of Cases in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania*, vol. iii. p. 48; Specht *v.* The Commonwealth, 8th June 1848, in Barr's *Reports of Cases* in the same Court, viii. 312; and City Council of Charleston *v.* S. A. Benjamin, in Strobhart's *Reports of Cases in the Court of Appeals of S. Carolina*, 8th June 1848, ii. 508.) The prohibition was enforced in these cases; but in the States of Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, Michigan, and Kentucky, there are enactments that no person who conscientiously believes that the seventh day of the week ought to be observed as the Sabbath, and actually refrains from secular business and labour on that day, shall be liable to penalties for performing secular business or labour on the Lord's day, or first day of the week, provided he disturbs no other person. (*Revised Statutes of Massachusetts*, 1836, Part I. tit. xiv. ch. 50, § 10; *Revised Statutes of New York*, vol. ii., p. 83, § 66; 15 *Ohio Rep.*, p. 225; *Revised Statutes of Michigan*, 1838, p. 210; *Revised Statutes of Kentucky*, 1852, p. 295.) Down to 1855 there was no such exemption in Pennsylvania, and I am not aware that any has since been conceded. In the State of New York there is also an enactment that "no person whose religious faith and practice is to keep the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday, as a day set apart by divine command as the Sabbath of rest from labour, and dedicated to the worship of God, shall be subject to perform military duty, or jury duty in a justice's court, on such day, except that such persons shall be subject to perform military duty on such day in case of invasion, insurrection, or in time of war." (*Laws of New York* of 1847, ch. 349, § 1.)*

13th century we have marvellous tales (which Heylin disbelieves) of judgments for working on Saturday afternoon, at which time, it seems, the observance of the Lord's day had been ordered to begin in England. "A carpenter making a wooden pin, and a woman making up her web, both after three on Saturday in the afternoon, are suddenly smitten with palsy. A certain man of Nafferton, baking a cake on Saturday night, and keeping part until the morrow, no sooner brake it for his breakfast but it gushed out blood. A miller of Wakefield, grinding corn on Saturday after three of the clock, instead of meal, found his bin full of blood, his mill-wheel standing still of its own accord." (*Id.* ch. vii. § 6.) On this subject see *Sabbath Laws, &c.*, pp. 450-6, 293, 313, 362-5, 560.

* In our own country, the question whether—and, if so, how far and on what grounds—the civil power is entitled to appoint and enforce the observance of Sunday as a day of rest, has frequently been debated. See Wardlaw, pp. 157, 177, 251, 268, 280; Macfarlan, p. 230; Bannerman, p. 279; Conder, ed. 1852, p. 21 (or *Eclectic Rev.* June 1830, p. 507; Oct. 1830, pp. 329, 336; and April 1832, p. 282); *Presb. Rev.*, vol. x. p. 334; R. W. Hamilton, pp. 158, 161; *New Monthly Mag.*, June 1833, p. 209; Baden Powell's Sermon on *The State Church* (Oxford, 1850); M'Crie's *Life of Sir A. Agnew*, ch. vii.; Cox's *Sabbath Laws, &c.*, pp. 30, 342-3; Hessey, Lect. viii.; and Mr Vinton's sermon on the *Civil Rela*

The Rev. Orville Dewey, in an article mentioned above (see p. 414), writes as follows:—"We do not think that the observance of the Sabbath which we earnestly wish to see, is to be brought about by any legislative enactments. Our hope of all that moral and religious improvement in society which we pray for, lies, first, in Christianity and the powerful preaching of it; then, in the press, in public opinion, in the patient and pure example of good men. We entertain doubts, too, though good and wise men differ here, whether the cessation of the great mails on Sunday is to be desired. The stage and the mail might stop, but private travelling and expresses would probably take their places, creating equal disturbance, and only, through the latter mode of communi-

tions of the Sabbath (above, p. 417). The following extract from a speech by the Rev. Dr John Brown Johnston, at a meeting of the United Presbyterian Presbytery of Glasgow on 14th March 1865, is remarkable for the precision and discrimination with which the speaker treats of this subject. "We should try," he said, "to avoid confounding the Christian ordinance of the Lord's day with the civil appointment of the weekly day of rest from labour and traffic. The fact that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, and that that day is also the day of weekly rest from labour and traffic, does not change the relations of these two institutions, although it has a tendency to introduce confusion into our reasonings respecting them. The more carefully we consider either the Christian ordinance of the Lord's day or the civil appointment of the day of weekly rest from labour and traffic, we shall probably see the more reason to avoid positive statements as to uniformity in the mode of observance. I do not know that there is any one thing that it is lawful for a Christian to do on any other day, but it might be lawful in certain circumstances for him to do on the Lord's day. According to the Shorter Catechism, 'works of necessity and mercy' may be performed; and I do not know any works which are not in themselves sinful that might not in certain circumstances become works of necessity and mercy. The cooking of food, the washing of clothes, the writing of letters, the travelling from one place to another either by sea or land, the drilling of troops, the fighting of battles, and thousands of other things, might in certain circumstances be works both of necessity and mercy. Whether they are such in any given circumstances must be determined, not by any positive and uniform test, for that is impossible, but by the judgments and consciences of individuals. Intelligent and conscientious ministers and elders, knowing that they are often doing and ordering others to do servile work on Sabbath, knowing that they buy and sell by means of letters that are carried on that day, that they eat bread and drink beer and whisky that were manufactured on that day, that they read newspapers that were printed on that day, will feel the necessity of avoiding positive and categorical enactments, and will feel the importance of pressing such general considerations as are fitted to promote increased spirituality of thought and feeling. They will feel the importance of urging professing Christians to ponder the thought of the influence of their example, and to exercise caution and self-denial for the benefit of others. There are many good men, I have no doubt, who abstain from certain things on the Lord's day which they would feel themselves at liberty to do in other circumstances, from a regard to the probable influence of their conduct on others; while there are other good men who do not abstain from these

cation, throwing greater advantages into the hands of capitalists. Besides, some works are proper to be done on Sunday, where the good to be accomplished is greater than the evil implied in the occupation. . . . We have no idea of anything as being a violation of the Sabbath, which promotes the real welfare and happiness of the people. However strong the argument may be made for the divine injunction of this observance, it will not be contended, we presume, that the mode of the observance for Christians is regulated by any particular precepts. This is left to our serious and devout judgment of expediency. Whatever is expedient on this day, whatever will most tend to promote order, virtue, happiness, in society, is right. 'The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.' . . . . If the utility of the institution shall be made to appear, we shall need no further proof of its being the will of God that we should observe it. . . . . It is often said there are cases of necessity and mercy which form exceptions

things: just as there are good men who abstain from intoxicating drink, one of the most frightful and prolific causes of Sabbath profanation, as of almost all other evils, that by their example they may discountenance the drinking customs of society; while there are others who do not feel themselves called upon to adopt this course. Regarding the civil appointment of the day of weekly rest from labour and traffic there is the same necessity for general principles rather than minute and specific injunctions that there is regarding the Christian ordinance of the Lord's day. An absolute cessation from labour is an impossibility, and any attempt to enforce such a thing, either by the pressure of opinion or by the arm of law, would be resisted as intolerably absurd and oppressive. With factories that are registered and under Government inspection there is comparatively little difficulty, but with sea-going ships, railway trains, iron-works, as well as with private household establishments, it is very different. The project to compel total cessation of work from twelve o'clock of one day till twelve o'clock the following day would, in many instances, be found impracticable; and it is only when cases can be made out of designed, and systematic, and wanton violation of the weekly rest, that the civil authority deems itself called upon or warranted to interfere. Nay more, in consequence of the division of labour in our time, it is quite a possible thing that a certain amount of work on the part of some persons may help and not hinder the rest from toil on the part of the great mass of the community, and there are many things which, though not likely to be done by Christian men who respect the Lord's day, are not at all incompatible with the ends contemplated in the civil appointment of a day of weekly rest from labour and traffic."

In a letter which appeared in the *Scotsman* of 11th May 1857, another thoughtful member of (as I judge) the United Presbyterian Church expresses his conviction "that the whole Sabbatical legislation of this country is based on a false principle, and that nothing would be a greater improvement than to sweep away the whole of it, substituting, however, in its place a law for the universal cessation for labour on the first day of the week, for reasons competent to a civil legislature to decide on (that day being chosen in preference to any other, in consequence of its being already, on religious grounds, devoted to rest by so large a portion of the community), and a law for protecting religious worship, by whomsoever performed, from disturbance at whatever time it may be observed."

from the sober and retired observance of the day, and it is asked, When these occur? We answer by the following rule;—not to do that which any considerable class of the community may do for as good a reason, and thus undermine the very foundation of the institution. This rule cuts off all the pleas of mere acquisition, convenience, and pleasure, because they may be the pleas of the whole community. It involves the only safe principle. The question is, whether, if other men should take liberties from our indulgence, if they should transact business, make journies, or engage in parties of pleasure, for the same reason that we do, or may do, whether there would be any Sabbath at all? We ought not to do that which is saved from being ruinous to the community only because it is confined to us. A good institution ought not to exist in spite of us, ought not to exist by our sufferance. This is not the treatment of it which becomes good members of society. No; it demands our countenance, our co-operation, our hearty and consistent aid. Besides, if it does exist in spite of us, who can tell how much our habitual or occasional departures from the rule now laid down, may tend to weaken the public respect for it, and to lead to its general neglect? Our actions are often the results of slight reflection or momentary impulse, but their effects may be experienced by generations to come." (*The Christian Examiner*, May 1829, pp. 229–240.)

To this I shall add another favourable specimen of American preaching, extracted from a sermon (above, p. 417) on the duties of the Sabbath, by the Rev. HARVEY D. GANSE, pastor of the Twenty-third Street Reformed Dutch Church, New York:—

"Are there any other legitimate means of hallowing the day that lie outside of the more formal religious acts? Is the whole Sabbath to be absorbed in offices of devotion? Is it to begin and proceed and end under the awe of a conscious and direct approach to God. Surely not. A good man, indeed, spends all his days, and especially his Sabbaths, as in God's sight. Love, and faith, and reverence take perpetual note of his presence. But formal devotion is more than the indulgence of these emotions. It is the most serious and responsible appeal of a soul to its Maker. It is the highest act both of intellect and feeling. Our minds were not meant to hold themselves perpetually to that highest exercise. It belongs to other beings 'continually to cry holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth.' Accordingly, through the week at least, we have to do with worldly things which, while they do not need to withdraw us from the presence or thought of God, do of necessity interrupt our direct devotions. And even upon the Sabbath, both our mental constitution and our relations to outward things demand frequent intermission in the exercise of worship. Nor is this necessity to be regretted. It is a part of God's plan, which is the wisest one. We are to be religious as men—not as angels. Our humility, our penitence, our gratitude, our faith, our joy, our very hope of heaven, all take colour from the actual condition in which we are. God touches us with providence and grace at every

point of our contact with surrounding things. And thus every object of wholesome interest has to a pious soul a voice for God. Those men have made the saddest of blunders who have withdrawn themselves from the world in order to get nearer to heaven. The ladder that scales heaven has its foot on earth. The pilgrim weary with a common journey, and anxious with common cares, gets from his pillow of stone the vision of ascending and descending angels. The Sabbath itself, with what taste of heaven there is in it, does not transport us thither, but brings heaven down to us. 'The Sabbath was made for man;' and there is no delicate taste, no generous affection, no warm desire of his regenerated nature, to which that holy day with its great thought of God reconciled in Jesus Christ does not appeal. Grace strings the harp again; and the Sabbath comes over it like a breath from heaven, and every string gives music.

"How well the holiness of the day of rest blends with thoughts and deeds of kindness, our Saviour has been careful to teach us. And no one can think of the countless activities of Christian charity which that day quickens in the home and the Sunday school, in the chamber of sickness, and among the abodes of ignorance and vice, without blessing God for Sabbath mercy, both in the name of 'him that gives and him that takes.'" (Pp. 141–4.)

In NOVA SCOTIA, the Sabbath question was somewhat violently stirred in 1860. Mr JAMES R. LITHGOW of Halifax, who, by studying the Bible, had become convinced that the Lord's-day is not the Sabbath, and that work upon it, however inexpedient in ordinary circumstances, is not in itself *sinful*, was induced by the impoverished condition of the fishermen of the colony to recommend in a newspaper that they should, during the short yearly fishing season, embrace such of the rare opportunities of taking a considerable quantity of mackerel or herrings, as might occur on Sundays. A controversy ensued, in which the Rev. Mr BREWSTER, Judge MARSHALL, and the Rev. W. H. HUMPHREY, combated his theological reasonings—the Judge, in a tract entitled *The Sabbath and the Bible Moral Law of Permanent Authority* (post 8vo, pp. 15); and Mr Humphrey in two sermons on *The Sabbath, a Moral and Positive Institution* (Halifax, N.S. 1860; post 8vo, pp. 32). Mr Lithgow was, however, backed by the Rev. N. GUNNISON in a Sermon on *The Origin, Perpetuity, and Use of the Sabbath*, delivered in the Universalist Church in Halifax, December 9, 1860 (post 8vo, pp. 16); and he himself reprinted his contributions to the newspaper, with an Introduction, and replies to his opponents, in a calm and well written pamphlet, entitled *The Sabbath Question, &c.* (Halifax, 1861; post 8vo, pp. 48). The proposition that the Lord's-day is not the Sabbath appears to have surprised and astounded the Nova Scotians, and Mr Lithgow himself was not at first aware that he had the Reformers and many other eminent theologians on his side. But by petitioning the Legislature for the *entire repeal* of the law prohibiting Sunday labour, he damaged

his cause in the opinion not only of those who differed from him on theological grounds, but of all who regarded the compulsory suspension of ordinary labour on a stated weekly day as a political regulation most beneficial to the community.

In GERMANY, Sabbatarianism is but seldom advocated. The principal treatise on that side is *Der Tag des Herrn und seine Feier*, by Dr F. LIEBETRUT (Berlin, 1837, 8vo), portions of which are translated by Mr Coleman in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. i. p. 526, *sqq.* On the other hand, the Dominical view is maintained by the well-known ecclesiastical writers, J. C. W. AUGUSTI (*Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Christlichen Archæologie*, Leipsic, 1817–1831, 12 vols. 8vo, and *Handbuch der Christlichen Archæologie*, Leipsic, 1836–7, 3 vols. 8vo); J. A. W. NEANDER, Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin (*General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, vol. i. pp. 406–411, and vol. iii. pp. 419–426, of the translation published by Bohn, Lond. 1851; *History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, vol. i. pp. 156–160 of Bohn's ed., Lond. 1851; and *Memorials of Christian Life in the Early and Middle Ages*, p. 260 *sqq.* of Bohn's ed., Lond. 1852); and Dr E. W. HENGSTENBERG, another Professor of Theology at Berlin, in his treatise on *The Lord's Day*, translated by James Martin (Lond. 1853, 8vo, pp. 106). See also OEHLER on the Sabbath, in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*; WINER'S *Biblisches Realwörterbuch* (3d ed., Leipsic, 1849); BÄHR'S *Symbolik des Mosaischen Kultus*, vol. ii. book iv. ch. 11, § 2 (Heidelb. 1837–9); and PLITT'S article on the State of the Sabbath Question in Germany, published in a volume mentioned above, p. 342. Dr Hessey (p. 241) mentions that in Germany "academical theses are constantly written upon the subject. Several of these I have seen. They are generally in the purely Ecclesiastical direction [see above, p. 388]. C. C. L. Franke, for instance, is determined that he will find no trace of an Apostolic and Divine origin for Sunday (*De Diei Dominici apud Veteres Christianos Celebratione*, Halle, 1826)." Speaking of the learned ecclesiastical historian Mosheim, Chancellor of Gottingen, who died in 1755, Dr Hessey states that he entertained the Apostolic phase of the Dominical opinion. "He held that the Lord's Day and the Sabbath were perfectly distinct institutions, and that the latter, which was a peculiarity of Judaism, has entirely passed away. And he held also, that the Lord's Day is so thoroughly traceable to the Apostles, so proved by the universality of its prevalence, and the consistency of the testimony concerning it, to be an institution of their founding under inspired guidance, as to demand, *Jure Divino*, the observance of Christians. He supplied, therefore,—at least so it seems to me,—exactly the hold upon the conscience, in which the purely Ecclesiastical view is defective. He was, however, unsuccessful in the enforcement of the higher view upon his countrymen." (P. 241.) Dr Hessey refers to Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, passim, and to his work *De Rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum*

Magnum, pp. 112–116, which he quotes in a note, p. 449. Both works have been translated into English. The views of Stryk and Michaelis respecting the Sabbath have already been noticed, above, pp. 134, 214.

The German treatise respecting the Lord's-day with which we in Britain are most familiar is Dr Hengstenberg's, already mentioned. Of this able work, in which the Sabbath is regarded as a merely Jewish institution, the table of contents is as follows: PART I. *The Old Testament; its letter and spirit:* 1. The rest of God on the seventh day. 2. The fall of manna suspended on the seventh day. 3. The fourth commandment. 4. The Sabbath a sign between God and the people. 5. The Sabbath not to be suspended in harvest. 6. No fire to be kindled. 7. The shew-bread renewed. 8. The Sabbatic year. 9. A man stoned for gathering wood. 10. The Sabbath a day of pleasure. 11. Blessing pronounced upon a proper observance of it. 12. Characteristics of its right observance. 13. A psalm for the Sabbath-day. 14. Neglect of the Sabbath by the Jews. 15. The disciples charged with a breach of the Sabbath. 16. Pharisaic scruples met by Christ. 17. Healing, the proper work of the Sabbath. 18. Paul's choice of the Sabbath for his missionary work. 19. Paul's warning against a distinction of days. 20. The Lord's-day. PART II. *The Sabbath of the Jews, and the Sunday of Christians:* 1. History of opinions on the connexion between the Sabbath and Sunday. 2. Investigation of that connexion. PART III. *Remedial efforts examined.*—To the chapter on "The Sabbath a day of pleasure," he prefixes as a motto, Hos. ii. 11, "I will cause all her mirth to cease, her feasts, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her festive seasons;" on which passage he observes:—

"The festivals, and especially the Sabbath, appear here as *days of mirth*. This is not indeed the principal feature, which, on the contrary, is said emphatically to consist in their being days of consecration, whilst it is denounced as a sin that they should be changed entirely into days of pleasure. But as a subordinate object, this is made very apparent, and it is only as a punishment for the neglect of the other that the pleasure is taken away. This design is indicated in the Mosaic law, though it is placed far behind the more important object. In Num. x. 10, the festivals in general are termed 'days of gladness;' and in Exod. xxiii. 12, the Sabbath is especially pointed out as a day of natural refreshment and recreation to those who through the week have borne the burden and heat of the day. With these expressions before us, we must acknowledge that Rothe is correct in saying, 'the festivals were essentially days of joy, and that not exclusively of a religious character;' and with reference to the weekly festival, 'this was to be essentially a day of rest and refreshment, a breathing time amidst the toil and trouble of the present state of being; a day of joy, in which a higher element of life should both invigorate and exalt.' It is not for us to be more oppressive and severe than God, who knows our labour and distress upon the earth, which he

has cursed; it is not for us to deprive the poor and oppressed of the people of that recreation and refreshment which his merciful love allowed in former times. We must not expect to promote the chief end by opposing or ignoring the minor object which was authorised by God himself. A melancholy, dull, oppressed spirit may indeed be brought to a certain pietistic level, but will never be able to soar with gladness to its God. And as God deprived the people of the festivals as days of joy, when they had refused to observe them as days of worship: so, on the other hand, to deny to the people all that is cheerful on such days as these, would only lead them sinfully to neglect them as days of worship too.

"In what way is the Church affected by this design of the festivals, including the Sabbath, of the Jews?

"The most evident duty of the Church is thus stated by Rothe: 'It has not only to take care that its worship shall not be disturbed by any other engagements of the day of rest, but to see also that these shall never be of such a kind as to clash with that calm spirit of worship which should pervade the whole day.' But it will not do for the Church to rest satisfied with this exclusively negative, overwatchful position. It will never succeed in checking the search for enjoyment elsewhere, unless it learns how to provide it within its own circle, and ceases to be so monotonous, so unbending, so stern and gloomy, so sermon-mad, as to be unable to teach its children to 'rejoice before the Lord.' (Lev. xxii. 40.)

"'Even enjoyment,' says Hircher, 'is not without a good effect upon the mind. It was, therefore, judicious and with good intention, that the Church introduced into its service much which was designed to help the poor and often downtrodden people to rejoice before the Lord. And even if processions, for example, could do little to edify, they were not without worth when regarded in this light, that they ministered to religious enjoyment.'

"In this respect our Church has greatly erred, and if it would but earnestly apply itself to the work, it might reap more fruit from this than from the other Sunday arrangements, which, indeed, must also continue, but to which many ministers of the Church are apt to attach too great importance. There may be cases in which the magistrate must be called upon to interfere, as, for instance, to protect servants against their masters, who wish to rob them of the Sunday. But for the Church to do this, is to proclaim its weakness and to disgrace itself, for its calling is of a different kind from this. The more the Church is in fault, for having by its austerity increased the disregard of the Sunday, the farther must it be prepared to go, that it may bring back to its worship, by the enjoyment it offers, those whom pleasure has led away. Love must instigate it not always to keep to the well-trodden and easy road of sermon-worship; must make it as fertile in the discovery of attractions and sacred pleasures, as the world has been in the invention of worldly amusements. Only this will make the Sunday attractive to the people again. He who thinks that this is beneath his dignity, forgets that he serves a church of

the people, which involves much that is difficult, but much also that carries a blessing with it, as surely as we have a Saviour, who came to seek that which was lost." (Pp. 33, 34.) Hengstenberg's opinion as to the use of the Mosaic law to Christians has already been briefly noticed above, i. 393; ii. 98; and on other subjects he is quoted in i. 217; ii. 6, 78, 118, 134. His book is highly approved of by Bunsen (*Hippolytus and his Age*, iii. 349, quoted in *Sabbath Laws*, p. 517).

In FRANCE, during the last thirty years, the better observance of the Lord's day has been frequently recommended by writers both clerical and lay. Its most eminent advocate is FRANÇOIS PÉRENNES, an intelligent, pious, and public-spirited Roman Catholic, whose work is entitled *De l'Institution du Dimanche, considérée principalement dans ses Harmonies avec les Besoins de notre Epoque* (Paris, 1845, 8vo, p. 384). It is divided into seven books, the contents of which are these:—"*Livre Premier:* Le Dimanche au dix-neuvième siècle. Ch. 1. Aux amis et aux contempteurs du Dimanche. 2. Réhabilitation poétique du Dimanche. 3. La raison publique et l'autorité civile. 4. Législation actuelle du Dimanche. *Livre II.* Les origines du Dimanche. Ch. 1. Des fêtes hebdomadaires chez les peuples monothéistes. 2. De la Semaine et des fêtes périodiques chez les peuples polythéistes. 3. Observations incidentes sur les fonctions du nombre septenaire. 4. Des fêtes hebdomadaires depuis l'ère chrétienne. 5. Conciles, Capitulaires, Ordonnances, Coutumes. *Livre III.* Hygiène. Ch. 1. La fatigue et le repos. 2. Du mode de périodicité le plus convenable pour le repos. *Livre IV.* Économie Politique. Ch. 1. Aperçu statistique. 2. Application de quelques principes de l'économie politique à l'observation du Dimanche. *Livre V.* Morale. Ch. 1. Nécessité d'établir un jour périodique destiné à rappeler les lois morales. 2. Avantages de la solitude du Dimanche. 3. De la base des lois morales. 4. De la science dans ses rapports avec la morale. 5. De la philosophie dans ses rapports avec la morale. 6. De la littérature considérée dans ses rapports avec la morale. 7. De l'économie politique dans ses rapports avec la morale. 8. De l'institution du Dimanche considérée dans ses rapports avec la morale. 9. Suite du même sujet. De quelques arrêtés administratifs. Conclusion de ce livre. *Livre VI.* Famille, société. Ch. 1. Influence du Dimanche sur l'esprit de famille. 2. Influence du Dimanche sur l'esprit public. 3. Divertissements publics. 4. Spectacles, Danses, Musique. 5. Mesures particulières. Fêtes nationales. *Livre VII.* Dieu. Ch. 1. La prière au temple, le ministre et l'enseignement du Dimanche. 2. Le culte intérieur et le culte extérieur. Sacrements. Fêtes. 3. Le Dimanche, d'après le concile de Trente. 4. Unité, Immortalité. *Notes.*"—M. Pérennès, while discountenancing all austerity in the observance of the Sunday, endeavours to convince the practical men of France that the suspension of business on that day, so far from being detrimental to their

interests, would be in every way beneficial. Theologically, the work is meagre; and the part in which the sacredness of the number *seven* is profusely treated of does not commend itself to the taste of the present times. In the following passage the influence of Scottish Sabbatarianism is not very highly appreciated:—"Le puritanisme a proscrit, dans les pays protestants, tout divertissement extérieur, il ne permet d'autre occupation que la lecture de la Bible, il tient dans une immobilité stupide les classes laborieuses.. Supposez que la croyance fléchisse dans l'opinion populaire, que l'éducation nationale ait été nulle ou viciée, que le pouvoir civil ne prenne pas sur lui d'intervenir pour diriger le repos et le délassement public; vous pressentez quels amusements le peuple va choisir. C'est pour cela que l'ivrognerie n'est nulle part plus répandue qu'en Écosse. Charles Ier et Georges [Jaques] Ier eurent tous deux la pensée de procurer au peuple des amusements et des fêtes; mais le préjugé religieux triompha de leur volonté." (P. 139.)—Written in a more ascetic spirit are *La Profanation du Dimanche considérée au point de vue de la Religion, de la Société, de la Famille, de la Liberté, du Bien-être, de la Dignité Humaine, et de la Santé*, par L'ABBÉ GAUME, Vicaire-Général de Nevers, 2me ed. (Paris, 1852; 18mo, pp. 204); and *The Sunday of the People in France*, by the ABBÉ MULLOIS, chaplain to the Emperor of France: translated from the French, with Introduction by Selina Bunbury (Lond. 1855, 24mo, pp. 48).—In 1853 appeared the first No. of a series entitled *Observateur du Dimanche*, published by a Roman Catholic association for the suppression of labour and traffic on Sunday. How long it continued to be published, I do not know.—Some years earlier, the noted socliiast PIERRE JOSEPH PROUDHON had written a striking pamphlet, *De la Célébration du Dimanche considérée sous les Rapports de l'Hygiène Publique, de la Morale, des Relations de Famille et de Cité* (Paris, 1850). His remarks (p. 67) on the advantages of the precise proportion established, six days of work to one of rest, and the inconvenience of any other that could be arranged, are specially recommended to attention by the Rev. Francis Garden, Subdean of Her Majesty's Chapels Royal, in his article "Sabbath" in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, iii. 1073 (Lond. 1863).* The recent efforts to promote Sunday-observance in France are noticed in the *British Quarterly Review*, No. XLI. p. 111; by Gaume, pp. 189–194; and by Charles Cochrane (above, p. 343). In 1837 there was published at Paris, in English as well as French, *An Essay on the Divine Origin and Perpetual Obligations of the Holy Sabbath*, by ROBERT NEWSTEAD (pp. 50). The contribution of Dr GRANDPIERRE to the English volume on *The Religious Condition of Christendom*, 1852, has been mentioned above, p. 342. Lastly, the Jewish Sabbath is briefly considered by J. SALVADOR in his *Histoire des Institutions de Moïse, et du Peuple Hébreu*, tome i. p. 87 (Paris, 1828, 8vo).

* The article "Lord's Day," in vol. ii. of this Dictionary, p. 134, is from the pen of Dr Ilessey.

In SWITZERLAND, Sabbatarianism is taught by the Evangelical School of Geneva; a pastor of which sect, D. MUNIER, published there, in 1851, *Trois Sermons sur le Dimanche et le Culte Public* (8vo, pp. 80). The Dominical side, again, is vigorously maintained in a work on *Sunday and the Sabbath*, by LOUIS VICTOR MELLET, pastor of Yvorne, translated into English (Lond. 1856, 12mo, pp. 106). Bred a Sabbatarian, M. Mellet had his faith shaken by the study of Dr Dwight's Sermon on *The Perpetuity of the Sabbath*, "in which," says he, "instead of positive proofs, drawn from the Word of God, I found only conjectures, suppositions, and weak probabilities, offered with an imperturbable assurance." A careful study of Scripture convinced him that the Lord's day is not the Sabbath, a conclusion which he afterwards found to agree with the views of the Church Fathers and the Reformers.

The opinions and practice of the modern Jews in regard to the Sabbath may be learnt from the following works:—*The Hebrew Ritual and Doctrinal Explanation of the whole Ceremonial Law, oral and traditionary, of the Jewish Community in England and Foreign Parts*, by L. ALEXANDER, Hebrew Typographer, p. 31–46 (Lond. 1814; 8vo, pp. 309).—*Modern Judaism; or, a Brief Account of the opinions, traditions, rites, and ceremonies of the Jews in modern times*, by JOHN ALLEN, chap. xix. (Lond. 1816; 2d ed., 1830).—*The Genius of Judaism*, ascribed to ISAAC D'ISRAELI, chapters vii. to x. (Lond. 1833; 12mo, pp. 266).—*The British Jews*, by the Rev. JOHN MILLS, Part III., section 6, on Sabbath-keeping (Lond. 1853); noticed in Kitto's *Journal of Sacred Literature*, July 1853, No. VIII. of N.S., p. 459.—*A Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament, with a new translation. Exodus.* By M. KALISCH (Lond. 1855; 8vo, pp. 624: see pages 299–301, 355–360, 593).—*The Development of the Religious Idea in Judaism, Christianity, and Mahomedanism*, by Dr LUDWIG PHILIPPSOHN; translated from the German; with notes, by Anna Maria Goldsmid (Lond. 1855, 8vo): see pages 76, 133.—*A Few Words to the Jews*, by One of Themselves (Lond. 1855; 18mo, pp. 210): the third and fourth chapters are on "The Labourer's Sabbath" and "The Day of Rest."—In the spring of 1865, several articles on the Sabbath appeared in the *Jewish Chronicle*, a newspaper published in London. From one of these (Feb. 3) is extracted the following statement of the manner in which the prohibition of work on the Sabbath is understood by the Rabbis:—

"The Fourth Commandment," says the writer, "is not a mere utopian law, the idle offspring of some speculative mind, an ideal set forth by a mere preacher, but is an ordinance given by an actual legislator to a people which was to practise it scrupulously. This people had, after the enactment of this law, a national existence of nearly fifteen centuries. During this period, as it was with every law, however carefully worded and however comprehensive its provisions, its administration must have given rise to numbers of judicial definitions and interpretations. It must have been deve-

loped, in accordance with certain well understood principles, by those best qualified for the task by minute acquaintance with the language in which the law was expressed, by general learning, high intelligence, and genuine piety. Whatever we may think of the controversy of the Sunday Sabbath, it is surely useful to know the opinion of the Rabbis on the manner in which this festival is to be observed. It is for the information of this portion of the public that we will exhibit the principles laid down by the Rabbis for the celebration of the Sabbath, in as far as they can be deduced from rabbinical decisions, prescriptions, and interpretations, and which principles clearly underlie all of them, although they are nowhere formally enunciated. These principles are—cessation of all designed productive activity; recreation; and sanctification: and to one, two, or all three of them, may be traced back every Sabbatical law enacted by the Rabbis, however extraordinary it may appear to those not penetrating beyond the surface.

"We formulate advisedly the first principle cessation of all designed productive activity, and not rest from work; for the former idea, and not the latter, is the leading one in the verb from which the Hebrew term Sabbath is derived. It will easily be perceived that the sphere of the former is much more comprehensive than that of the latter, including as it does, not only all kinds of physical labour, but also every mental operation the object of which is material gain. Were we now concerned in establishing the correctness of the rabbinical view, we should have no difficulty in showing how logically the boundless extent of this sphere is narrowed within necessary and reasonable limits by the restricting epithets 'designed' and 'productive;' for if every kind of activity had been forbidden, a total inaction must have been the consequence. There must have been enjoined a kind of torpidity, bordering on the condition in which certain animals find themselves periodically, and which we call hybernation. Sleep during the whole of the Sabbath would in this case have been the only state befitting the Jew, and which would naturally have left no room either for recreation or sanctification. It is clear that the strict application of this principle, which periodically put a compulsory stop to all wrangling and striving for pelf, and temporarily checked man in his mad race after an increase of worldly advantages, was only a stage, a necessary preparation, paving the way for the application of the other two principles. It was, in fact, only a means for an object. This principle will show how a Jew, consistently with the due observance of the Sabbath, may visit botanical gardens, museums, picture galleries, or other places of public resort not immoral in their nature, since these are not thrown open for gain. It would, of course, be different had he to pay on that day for his entry, for in this case gain would be clearly the object of the exhibition. Nor would the keepers of these public places be guilty of a violation of the Sabbath were they to remain at their post on the Sabbath, provided they did not demand extra pay for this duty; for what is forbidden is designed

productive activity, and the rest involved in this prohibition is not broken by a disinterested activity for the public welfare, imposing no labour coming within the term of 'work' forbidden by the Fourth Commandment. This naturally leads us to the examination of those labours and employments which the Rabbis considered as coming within the category of work especially forbidden by the Fourth Commandment.

"Had there existed at the time dictionaries, such as we possess in our modern languages, nothing would have been easier than to solve the question. The inquiring Rabbi would only have had to consult the book of some authoritative lexicographer, and he would have found all the various meanings of מלאכה (the term employed in the Fourth Commandment), just as we should find in an English dictionary all the applications of the equivalent word 'work.' But the Rabbis possessed no such means. Recourse was therefore to be had to another. For this purpose most, if not all, passages in the Pentateuch were examined in which this term occurs, and in which the kind of labour or employment meant was afterwards described. For this the erection of the tabernacle afforded special facilities. In the minute description of its construction the word commented upon is of frequent occurrence, while the performances referred to by it are each time specified. By this process the Rabbis arrived at the conclusion that there were thirty-nine kinds of labour which came within the general prohibition of work, and by analogy a number of other performances not directly interdicted were likewise forbidden, since they resembled in their nature those distinctly prohibited. It is clear that the number of Sabbatical laws must thereby have been infinitely increased. We are not here to examine whether this extraordinary extension of the rabbinical prohibitions is justified in every instance, or whether the analogy is always correct. Suffice it for our purpose to show that these rigorisms were not arbitrary, and did not spring from a desire of converting a day of joy into one of gloom, but that they sprang from a rational principle, which the Rabbis believed to be founded in Scripture and reason. From this exposition it is also evident that a Jew in partnership with a Gentile, who naturally does not consider the Sabbath binding upon him, may, consistently with the due observance of the Sabbath, allow the business to be continued on that day, provided he resigns his share of the gain that would accrue to him from any transactions therein; for his mind would be as free from all anxiety on the Sabbath as though the business had been suspended on that day.

"To the general application of this broad principle expounded by us there is one exception, and this is in case of any grave illness; for in such an emergency the Jew is not only permitted by the Rabbis to break every Sabbatical law requisite for the relief of the patient, but is absolutely enjoined to do so. On this head, perhaps, it will be best to translate the passage (from Maimonides) which has reference to this subject:—

"'In perils of life the Sabbath laws, as well as every other com-

mandment, are suspended. Therefore we may, at the declaration of a regular practitioner of the place, prepare for a patient who is in danger everything requisite for him. And if it be doubtful whether his case requires a desecration of the Sabbath or not, or if one physician says it is requisite, and another is of a different opinion, the Sabbath is to be desecrated; for in cases in which it is even doubtful whether life is in danger, the Sabbath laws are suspended. . . . . We may desecrate even a hundred Sabbaths so long as it is for the good of the patient, and there is danger, or even a presumption of danger. We may light a candle for him, kill, bake, and boil for him, warm water for him, be it to give him drink or to wash him. The rule is, Sabbath, in regard to a patient labouring under grave illness, is like a working day in respect to everything requisite for him.

"'When any of these things are done, the work is not to be performed by a Gentile, children, servants, or women, lest the Sabbath be slighted by them, but by the great men of Israel and their sages; and every delay on account of the Sabbath is forbidden, for it is written, 'Which man may do and live in them,' and not that he should die through them. From this we learn that the ordinances of the law have not been given to bring austerity (revenge) into the world, but compassion, mercy, and peace. And in reference to those perverse ones who say that it is a desecration of the Sabbath, and therefore forbidden, the prophet says, 'I also have given them statutes that are not good, and judgments wherein they cannot live.'"

"We will on this occasion, and only incidentally, state that if the Pharisees are represented in the Gospel as charging Jesus with the desecration of the Sabbath for having on that day undertaken a cure, it was not because they believed that healing the sick on the Sabbath was unlawful, but because they believed that since those on whom he was said to have exercised his miraculous powers suffered from infirmities or defects of long standing, which, moreover, did not endanger life, the cure might just as well have been undertaken on some other day. But not only did the relief of sickness justify the violation of the Sabbath laws, an exception was also made in favour of domestic animals, if abstinence from certain prohibited work would have inflicted upon them unnecessary pain, or, as the Rabbis express it, משום צער בעלי חיים. We translate from the same authority the short passage which refers to it:—

"'In the same way a burden may be taken off a beast on Sabbath, on account of the law which forbids the inflicting of (unnecessary) pain on a living creature.' And further on:—'In no case shall one allow a (certain) burden to remain (on Sabbath) on the back of a brute, because it would inflict pain on a living creature.'

"This will show how consistently, and yet how humanely, the Rabbis expounded the Fourth Commandment, and whether they deserve those taunts involved in the reproach against the Scotch Puritans, when they are charged with wishing to enforce upon the people a Jewish Sabbath."

SUPPLEMENT TO VOLUME II.

Page 6.—*Controversies in the Netherlands about the Sabbath.*

A fuller account than Hengstenberg's of the successive controversies in the Netherlands during the seventeenth century is given by Mr Gilfillan, pp. 98–126, who applauds or disparages the disputants according to their agreement or disagreement with the Puritans whose Sabbatarianism he advocates.

Page 6.—*The Seventh-Day Baptists.*

About the year 1658, THOMAS TILLAM, "minister of the Gospel" at Colchester, published a book entitled "The Seventh-Day Sabbath sought out and celebrated." It was replied to by WILLIAM JENNISON, in "A Lash for a Liar: or a Word of Warning to all Christians to take heed of Thomas Tillam, who is now discovered by his preaching and printing to be a common slanderer of as many as are contrary to his opinions" (Lond. 1658; sm. 4to, pp. 78). As to Tillam, see above, p. 58.

In *Christianismus Primitivus, or the Ancient Christian Religion*, by THOMAS GRANTHAM, a Baptist minister (Lond. 1678), Book ii. ch. 12, are set forth "the reasons why the Christian Church is not bound to the observation of the Seventh-Day's Sabbath according to the law of Moses, and yet that they are under the obligation of the moral part of the Fourth Commandment of the Decalogue, Exod. xx." There is a biographical sketch of Grantham in Brook's *Lives of the Puritans*, iii. 456.

GABRIEL TOWERSON, also, in his *Exposition of the Decalogue*, p. 163 (Lond. 1681), and G. T. (George Trosse?) in *The Lord's Day vindicated, or the First Day of the Week the Christian Sabbath; in answer to Mr Bampfield* (Lond. 1692; 8vo, pp. 134), have replied to the Seventh-Day Baptists.

Page 18.—MATTHEW CRAWFORD.

Crawford was a young Scotchman, who, having gone to study in Holland, was surprised and shocked by the contrast between the strict observance of the Sunday to which he had been accustomed at home, and the laxity with which he found it observed by the Dutch, and the rejection of Sabbatarianism by many of their theologians. He was therefore led to write several "Disputations" in

its defence, but Burmann, he says, employed successfully his powerful influence to quash the discussion. Crawford's *Exercitatio Apologetica*, of which Mr Gilfillan (p. 122) gives some account, and which was published at Utrecht, may be seen in the Library of Glasgow College. He became the minister of Eastwood, near that city, and was succeeded there by Wodrow.

Page 54.—JOHN BROWN, *Minister of Wamphray.*

This writer published at Rotterdam, in 1674–6, the bulkiest of all the books on the Sabbath controversy. Vol. i. is entitled "De Causâ Dei contra Anti-Sabbatarios Tractatus: Tomus primus, complectens Libros tres priores—puta, I. De Legibus Divinis; II. De Cultu ac Tempore solenni; III. De Sabbati natura et origine;" 4to. pp. 757. Vol. ii. is entitled "De Causâ, &c.: Tomus secundus, complectens Libros tres posteriores—puta, IV. De Decalogo, et speciatim de quarto Decalogi præcepto; V. De Die Dominico; VI. De Sanctificatione Diei Dominici;" 4to, pp. 1012. The book is so rare that I have found it only in the Glasgow College Library. Concerning it and its author the following particulars are given by Mr Gilfillan:—

"Having for his opposition to the restoration of Charles II. been ejected from his parish and imprisoned, he was, in consequence of his own representation that his life was in danger from confinement in a damp cell, liberated on condition that he 'obliged himself to remove and depart off the King's dominions, and not to return without license from his Majesty and Council under pain of death.' This good and learned man passed his remaining days in Holland, residing partly at Utrecht and partly at Rotterdam, enjoying the intimate friendship of Leydecker, Spanheim, Borstius, and à Brakel, by all of whom he was highly esteemed for his theological attainments, and engaged in occasional preaching, corresponding with his friends in Scotland, and in writing and publishing useful works, which the above-mentioned and other friends did everything in their power to circulate. The resentment of Charles followed him, and obliged him in 1677 to leave Rotterdam, where, however, after a brief sojourn in Utrecht or its neighbourhood, he again resided till his death in 1679. (Steven's *Scot. Church at Rotterdam*, pp. 38–69.) His principal, though least popular work, and, we should suppose, the largest ever published on the subject, is the *De Causâ Dei contra Anti-Sabbatarios Tractatus*, or, *Treatise on the Cause of God against the Anti-Sabbatarians*, which appeared at Rotterdam in two volumes, the first in 1674, the second in 1676. Prefixed are approving notices by Professors Arnold of Franeker, Voet and Essen of Utrecht, and Spanheim of Leyden. In an epistle dedicatory to the Rotterdam authorities, Brown expresses similar views and feelings to those of Crawford, in reference to the prevalent profanation of the Sabbath in Holland, and the encouragement given to it by the inculcation in writings, catechisings, and sermons, of opinions such as he had

never before heard, 'even from the mouths of the most profligate.' He sets forth, in their own words, the sentiments of the ablest writers for and against the Sabbath as a moral, catholic, perennial, Divine institution. Hence the formidable extent of the treatise, and yet its inestimable value to those particularly who have not the means of consulting the original authors. Nor is it a mere compilation. Not the least important portions are the clear, able, and conclusive statements of Brown himself. Koelman says that no part of it was answered by Burmann. Neither he, indeed, nor any other, could be expected to attempt a full reply to a work of such dimensions. But why has it been so little noticed by the supporters of adverse views? Have not some of them felt that it would injure their cause to remit inquirers to the convincing arguments of such a man?" (P. 124.)

Ignorance of the existence of a voluminous and extremely scarce Latin book printed abroad, and the greater accessibility of the English treatises on the same side, are much more probable causes of the silence not only of "the supporters of adverse views," but —what might have equally attracted Mr Gilfillan's attention— of the supporters of his own. If any of the convincing arguments in the book are peculiar, Mr Gilfillan would have done well to present them. I shall here quote one of its statements, which seems to be not very favourable to the Puritan interpretation of the Fourth Commandment: "*Sanctificare* communiter idem est quod *separare*;" "*To sanctify* commonly means *to separate*" (vol. ii. p. 210): consequently, as Brown expressly admits, it does not indicate in the commandment "the *manner* of sanctifying the Sabbath." But in affirming that in *no part* of the commandment is the mode of sanctification of the Sabbath prescribed, he represents it as a surprisingly defective law, and assumes, without the slightest reason, that the prescribed *rest* neither is nor can be the (or even *a*) mode of "separating" the seventh day from the others.

Brown was an intimate friend of Koelman, who, doubtless, in his similar treatise on the Sabbath (above, p. 137), borrowed much from his predecessor. To Koelman he bequeathed a MS. treatise entitled *The Life of Justification Opened*, which remained unpublished till after Koelman's death in 1695, and was edited in that year by Leydecker, a professor of divinity at Utrecht. In his preface the editor says that Brown's praise "lives deservedly in the Churches, and his light did for a considerable space shine here in our Low Countries, when, through the iniquity of the times, he was, because of his zeal, piety, faithfulness, and good conscience, obliged to leave his native land. Yet was he not idle; for while he was here he wrote with a great deal of wisdom against the philosophers of this time, who would subject the Scriptures to philosophy, setting up human reason for a rule of Scripture interpretations. Moreover, he was known in our churches by his books of the perpetual morality of the Sabbath, written with great efficacy of arguments, and approved by F. Spanheim, that worthy

and most famous divine of our age; besides what other treatises he wrote in English."

There are notices of Brown and his writings in *The Edinburgh Christian Instructor*, xxi. 659, 778; xxiii. 827.

Page 70.—ROBERT BARCLAY.

The following is extracted from Barclay's *Truth Cleared of Calumnies*, 1670:—

"Thou wouldest prove, 'That the Lord's people are under a tie and engagement to keep the first day of the week for a sabbath.' For a *first reason*, thou sayest, 'The fourth commandment requires the keeping holy of one day in seven.' But as it requires the observation of *one day* of *seven*, so it expressly instanceth that day to be the *seventh*, which day ye keep not. Wherefore, as to the second reason, 'If the command be moral and perpetual,' as thou callest it, 'it ought to be kept in every point of it;' which ye not doing, therein condemn yourselves. But the outward sabbath, or the keeping one day of the week for a sabbath, is not perpetual, but abolished, together with the new moons, and other feasts of the Jews. See Coloss. ii. 16, 17, 'Let no man judge you in meat or drink, or holy day, or new moon or sabbath days, which are a shadow of the things to come:' see also Rom. xiv., which plainly holds forth all days under the gospel to be alike. And said Paul to the Galatians; 'Ye observe days, &c., I am afraid of you.' For a *third* reason, thou sayest, 'That Jesus Christ plainly intimates the continuance of a sabbath, because that, speaking of the desolation of Jerusalem, he said, Pray that your flight be not in the winter, nor on the sabbath day.'

"ANSWER.—But that sabbath day is neither here nor elsewhere said to be the first day of the week. The Jews were to flee at that time; and Christ holds forth their difficulties, that it should be grievous unto them, to be put to it to flee on their sabbath day, or be killed; for they kept it in the strictness of it. But as for any of your sabbath-keepers, they are not so strait-laced, but they will do less necessary things than to flee from a danger on that day. And as the outward Jew desireth, that he may not be put to flee on his outward sabbath, so the inward Jew in spirit desireth much more, that he may keep his sabbath, which is his spiritual rest in Christ, that the enemy oft seeketh to break, to cause him to flee on his sabbath day; but this to you is a mystery, viz.; what the Sabbath of them who believe, is. Heb. iv. 9, 10.—'There remaineth then a sabbatism to the people of God; and he that is entered into his rest, hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his.'

"And that this *sabbath* or *rest* is not an outward day, is plain, because in the next verse he saith, 'Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest.' But if it were an outward day, it might be easily entered into; but this is such a rest as none can enter into who hearken not to the voice of the Lord by believing and obeying it.

"For a *fourth* reason, thou sayest, 'Though ye keep not the same day the Jews did, ye have the same authority for keeping your day, that they had for theirs. Hence this day, that we keep (sayest thou), is called the Lord's day (Rev. i. 10), it being set apart by the Lord for his service, and as a special memorial of his resurrection.'

"ANSWER.—But for all this, here is no probation at all, but mere assertions. If ye have the same authority, produce it, and let us see it. John was in the spirit on the Lord's day, therefore the first day of the week ought to be kept. How hangs this together? Prove that John meant the first day of the week. We read much in Scripture of the day of the Lord, which is the Lord's day; but no where do find it called the first day of the week, or any other natural day, for it is spiritual.' And as God called the natural light *day*, so he calleth the spiritual light of his appearance (where the Sun of Righteousness ariseth with healing under his wings) *day*. And this is the *day of the Lord*, wherein his people rejoice, and are glad. And whereas thou sayest, 'It is set apart by the Lord, as a special memorial of his resurrection,' this is thy naked assertion, without any shadow of proof. And if thou wilt say, that therefore it is to be a holy day, because he rose on it, is not this a fair inlet to all the Popish holy days? If ye keep one day for his resurrection, why not one day for his conception, another for his birth, another for the annunciation of the angel, another for his being crucified, another for his ascension? And then we shall not want holy days in good store.

"FIFTHLY.—Thou sayest, who oppose the sabbath day, sin against mercy, and equity, and justice.

ANSWER.—It is granted: but who oppose *your day*, which ye have made or imagined to be the Sabbath, do no sin against any of the foresaid, if in other things they keep unto the rule of mercy and justice.

"FIRST.—They sin not against mercy, if through all the days of the week they be found in that, which is for the good of themselves and their neighbours; not laying too heavy burthens upon their own souls by excessive care and labour in outward things, nor yet forcing their bodily strength beyond the rule of mercy and love, nor imposing any things upon either servants or cattle contrary to mercy. For if the law required mercy even in these things, much more the gospel; so that we grant, times of rest are to be given unto servants and beasts, and mercy is to be showed unto them more than under the law. And thus is the end of the sabbath answered, which was made for man; yea, this is indeed to keep the sabbath; 'to undo every burden, and to let the oppressed go free,' both as to the inward and outward. And the Lord's people have frequent times, more than once a week, wherein, laying aside their outward affairs for a season, they may and do meet together to wait upon the Lord, and be quickened, and refreshed, and instructed by him, and worship him in his spirit, and may be useful unto one another in exhortation, or admonition,

or any other way, as the Lord shall furnish. And such, who find any distemper upon their minds, through letting them go forth too much upon outward things, may find the Lord allowing them any other day or time, no less than that, to get their hearts reduced into a right frame. And it were sad, if the Lord had only allowed but one day of seven unto this effect. The Lord inviteth and alloweth the weary and distempered (who love to be cured of their distempers) to come unto him *every day*. And as for those who abide not in a due care every day to have their hearts ordered aright, but let their minds go forth excessively in outward occasions all the week, they provoke the Lord to shut them out from access to him upon the *first day*. And our souls do oft bless the Lord, in allowing us many times of refreshment and strengthening, to the establishing and confirming us in his love and life, and disburdening our minds of earthly things much more frequently than in one day of seven.

"SECONDLY.—And as for sinning against justice, they cannot be charged with it, who give up unto the Lord not only one day of seven, but all the seven, even all the days of their life, unto his service; for equity and justice calleth upon us to spend all the seven in his service, that our hearts may continually be exercised in his fear and love, and whatever we do, we may do it to him, and in him. And as for the first day of the week, we meet together even on that day (as we do on other days), according to the practice of the primitive Christians, to wait upon the Lord and worship him; but to plead so obstinately as ye do, that the Fourth Commandment bindeth to a particular observation of that day, and yet to be found so slack in the observation of it as you generally are, is such an inconsistency as the Quakers cannot own. And so whereas thou wouldst confine the Lord his giving rest and comfort to the souls of his people, and the falling of manna, to the first days, calling them 'spiritual market-days,' as if there were no other, we cannot own it; knowing, that the Lord giveth rest and comfort every day, and causeth the manna plentifully to fall every day to those that walk in his fear, and wait upon him, and he has no such circumscribed 'market-day' as thou dreamest of."

In his *Short Examination of some of the Scripture Proofs alleged by the Divines at Westminster to prove divers articles in their Confession of Faith and Catechism*, 1673, Barclay argues thus:—

"In chap. xxi. sect. 7, where they say, 'That the Sabbath from the resurrection of Christ was changed into the first day of the week, which in Scripture (say they) is called the Lord's day, and is to be continued to the end of the world, as the Christian sabbath;' they assert three things.

"1. That the first day of the week is come in place of the seventh for a Sabbath.

"To prove which, they allege 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2—'Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every

one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him; that there be no gathering when I come.' Acts xx. 7—'And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached to them, ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his speech until midnight.'

"That these proofs assert not the things expressly, we need not, I suppose, dispute. Now to say, that because Paul desires the Corinthians to lay something by them in store that day; or because he brake bread, and continued his speech until midnight; therefore the first day of the week is come in place of the sabbath; is a consequence more remarkable for its sottishness, than to be credited for its soundness. Indeed, to make so solemn an article of faith, as these men would have the morality of the first day of the week to be, would need a more positive and express authority. The text doth clearly enough tell the reason of the disciples meeting so frequently, and of Paul preaching so long, because he was ready to depart to-morrow; it speaks not a word of its being sabbath.

"2. Their *second* assertion, 'That the first day of the week is therefore called the Lord's day,' is drawn more strangely from that of Rev. i. 10, 'I was in the spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet;' whereas no particular day of the week is mentioned. So for them to say, John meaned the first day of the week, hath no more proof but their own bare assertion.

"3. For their *third* assertion, 'That it is to be continued to the end of the world, as the Christian sabbath,' they allege these Scriptures: Exod. xx. 8, 10, 11 [which is quoted]; Isa. lvi. 2, 4, 6, 7 Mat. v. 17, 18, 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil: For verily, I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.'

"If they prove any thing, they must needs prove the continuance of the seventh day; seeing in all the law there is no mention made of the first day of the week being a sabbath. If these may be reckoned good and sound consequences, I know no absurdities so great, no heresies so damnable, no superstitions so ridiculous, but may be clothed with the authority of Scripture."

These extracts I have found in a collection, printed at Belfast in 1832, of passages about the Christian Sabbath, from the writings of eminent Quakers.

Page 73.—Dr Gabriel Towerson.

In regard to recreation on the Sabbath, this writer delivers his opinion in the following terms:—

"As nothing hinders but at the same time men might cease from labour, and yet not cease from recreation; so he that shall consult either the Jewish writers, or their present practice, will

find them not to have understood it to have extended to the prohibition of it. Whence it is that Lyra, a converted Jew, speaking of their permitting 'a Sabbath-day's journey,' allegeth for the reason of it, 'That such a walk was more a recreation than a labour;'* for which cause it was not against the rest enjoin'd. And indeed (however some men's prejudices have made it otherwise thought), neither is recreation, provided it be moderate, any way unsuitable to their feasts, or ours. For, as it is but reasonable that the body should share with the soul in its joys, as well as be afflicted in its griefs; so recreation, rightly dispos'd, may make the mind so much the more apt to intend the offices of religion. In fine, take away all recreation, and you make the Sabbath to afford little refreshment to servants and other such labouring people, for whose benefit we find it to have been in a great measure design'd; a continu'd intention of mind, especially to those who know not the pleasure of contemplation, being no less wearisome to the flesh, than the labour of the body. The only thing that can in reason be offer'd against the allowance of recreations, is that of Isa. lviii. 13, where we find 'the doing and finding of one's own pleasure,' join'd with 'the doing of a man's own ways,' as equally unlawful on the Sabbath. But beside that the word we render 'pleasure,' doth also signify 'purpose,'† which, if admitted here, may convert it to another sense; beside, secondly, that no other may be meant, than the forbidding of pleasures in excess, and when they are us'd rather to thrust out the worship of God, than to fit men the better, and render them more apt for the practice of it; both the Chaldee‡ and the Septuagint§ understand it of 'the pleasure of gain,' of making provision for their necessities and commodities. Which restriction is the rather to be admitted, as because the Sabbath was ordain'd for 'refreshment,'‖ so because there is not the least mention elsewhere of forbidding recreation on it. Add hereunto, what will farther confirm the former notion, that of the same prophet, verse 3, 'Behold in the day of your fast you find pleasure, and exact all your labours.' For as it is probable from what he there subjoins concerning the 'exacting of their labours,' that he meant no other pleasure than the pursuing of their profits; so, that he could not mean pleasures, in the proper acception of the word, the fifth verse of the same chapter shews, he there intimating that they

* "Vid. Seld. de Jure Nat. & Gent. lib. 3, c. 9.

† "Vid. Eccl. iii. 1, ubi quod in Heb. חפץ לכל LXX. reddunt τῷ παντὶ πράγματι. Chald. 'Omni negotio,' sensu etiam id postulante.

‡ "Chal. pro eo quod est in Heb.——'faciendo voluntatem tuam, ——ut non facias necessaria tua pro—— ab inveniendo voluntatem tuam ——neque provideas in eo quæ tibi necessaria sunt.'

§ "LXX. pro—'à faciendo vias tuas, ab inveniendo voluntatem tuam, ——οὐκ ἀρεῖς τὸν πόδα σου ἐπ' ἔργῳ.

‖ "Vid. Exod. xxiii. 12, ubi LXX. Ἵνα ἀναψύξῃ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης σου, &c."

were not wanting in afflicting their souls, which shews they were far from finding pleasure. This only would be added, That as recreation, how lawful soever in itself, may upon other days become unlawful, according as it may happen to be circumstantiated; so it will become so more especially upon this, if either it be unsuitable for the kind to the gravity of such a solemnity, or take up too much time in the exercise thereof. Upon which account, I should make no difficulty to condemn, (as the statute 1 Caroli, chap. 1, did) all meetings, assemblies, or concourse of people, out of their own parishes, for any sports or pastimes whatsoever, or any bear-baiting, bull-baiting, enterludes, or common plays, within them; these latter, as they are rarely managed without either those vanities or heats which are very unsuitable to the day, so both the one and the other being not well to be either provided for, or attended to, (according as that statute remarks) without entrenching upon those duties for which it was set apart. Besides, when it is apparent how great the necessities of men's souls are, and how little leisure the common sort have to consider them upon other days; when it is farther apparent how ill the other festivals of the church are observ'd, and consequently how little likelihood there is of men's supplying those necessities in them by a conscionable discharge either of public or private duties of religion; lastly, when it is apparent how apt men are to exceed, and, upon a pretence of the lawfulness of recreation on it, to convert that day, which was set apart for God's service, into a day of sloth or merriment; it is easy to see how much it concerns men to set bounds to their recreations on it, and avoid a profane neglect, as well as a too nice and superstitious observation of it." (Pp. 177, 178.)

The meaning of the words in Isa. lviii. 13, is considered in *What is Sabbath-breaking? A Discussion occasioned by the proposal to open the Botanical Gardens of Edinburgh on Sunday afternoons* (Edin. 1863), pp. 9, 17, 19–22, 23, 55, 57, 90. See also below, p. 461, *n.*, and the Index of Texts.

Page 74.—"*The Patriarchal Sabbath.*"

There is a copy of this rare book in the Library of Sion College, London. Its full title is, "The Patriarchal Sabbath, instituted Gen. ii. 3, the same with the Lord's Day;" Lond. 1683, 8vo. Wotton, who quotes it in his *Miscellaneous Discourses*, i. 307 (above, p. 165), gives J. S. as the author's initials. They are probably those of John Smith, who in 1694 published a similar work, noticed above, p. 100.

In the same library are two books not hitherto mentioned—*The Mystery of the Sabbath Discovered*, by EDMUND PORTER, B.D. (Lond. 1659, 8vo); and *A Treatise of Prayer and of the Judaical Observation of the Lord's Day*, by GEORGE BRIGHT, D.D. (Lond. 1678, 8vo.)

Page 77.—JOHN SPENCER.

As to Spencer's opinion that cessation from work was the only appointed mode of "sanctifying" the Sabbath-day, see, in this volume, pp. 107, 112, 113, 146, 164, 204, 244, 358, 382, 449, 456, 458, 460–2; and vol. i. pp. 377, 396–402: also *Sunday, the Rest of Labour*, p. 135; and *What is Sabbath-breaking?* pp. 76–86. Dr Hessey (p. 421) points out that it is as old as Chrysostom (*39th Hom. on Matt.*). He adds that Michaelis in his *Comm. on the Laws of Moses*, Art. 195, condemns it strongly; but I can find nothing of the kind any where in Michaelis. He says, indeed, that the Sabbath was ordained to be a day of worship as well as of rest and recreation (above, p. 215); but he admits that in the Law of Moses no *form* of worship is mentioned except the duplication of the daily sacrifice—by which test *every* day must be held to have been a day of worship. Spencer's opinion is however combated by Basnage, *Hist. of the Jews*, B. v. ch. 11; Hallet, vol. iii. p. 114; Holden, p. 119; and the followers of the Reformers and Puritans.

Page 80.—JOHN BUNYAN.

The *first* question discussed by Bunyan is, "Whether the seventh-day sabbath is of, or made known to man by, the law and light of nature? He answers it in the negative, and adds—"Nor doth this at all take away a whit of that sanction which God once put upon the seventh-day sabbath, unless any one will say, and by sufficient argument prove, that an ordinance for Divine worship receiveth greater sanction from the law of nature than from a Divine precept, or standeth the stronger when it is established by a law human, for such is the law of nature, than when imposed by revelation of God. But the text will put this controversy to an end. The sanction of the seventh-day sabbath, even as it was the rest of God, was not till after the law of nature was completed; God rested the seventh day and sanctified it (Gen. ii. 3). Sanctified it; that is, set it apart to the end there mentioned, to wit, to rest thereon."

The *second* question is,—"Whether, the seventh-day sabbath, as to man's keeping of it holy, was ever made known to, or imposed by a positive precept upon him until the time of Moses?" This also, for the reasons assigned, is answered in the negative.

The *third* is,—"Whether when the seventh-day sabbath was given to Israel in the wilderness, the Gentiles, as such, were concerned therein?" Again the answer is No; and the following remarks are added:—

"When the Gentiles, at the Jews' return from Babylon, came and offered their wares to sell to the children of Israel at Jerusalem on this sabbath; yea, and sold them to them too; yet *not they*, but the *Jews*, were rebuked as the only breakers of that sabbath. Nay, there dwelt then at Jerusalem men of Tyre, that on

this sabbath sold their commodities to the Jews and men of Judah: yet not they, but the men of Judah, were contended with, as the breakers of this Sabbath.

"True, good Nehemiah did threaten the Gentiles that were merchants, for lying then against the walls of the city, for that by that means they were a temptation to the Jews to break their sabbaths; but still he charged the breach thereof *only* upon his own people. (Neh. xiii. 15–20.)

"Nor can it be imagined, had the Gentiles now been concerned with this sabbath by law divine, that so holy a man as Nehemiah would have let them escape without a rebuke for so notorious a transgression thereof; especially considering, that now also they were upon God's ground, to wit, within and without the walls of Jerusalem."

Question IV.—"Whether the seventh-day sabbath did not fall, as such, with the rest of the Jewish rites and ceremonies? or whether that day, as a sabbath, was afterwards by the apostles imposed upon the Churches of the Gentiles?" *Answer:* It fell, and was *not* imposed upon the Gentiles.

Question V.—"Since it is denied that the seventh-day sabbath is moral, and it is found that it is not to abide as a sabbath for ever in the Church, what time is to be fixed on for New Testament saints to perform Divine worship to God by Christ in?" He answers that Sunday is the time; a conclusion thought by him to be plainly deducible from John xx. 19, 26; Acts ii. 1; xx. 6, 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, and Rev. i. 10; and less directly intimated in Heb. iv. 10; Matt. xii. 8; xxvii. 52, 53; Luke vi. 5; Psal. cxviii. 22–24; Acts iv. 11; xiii. 33; Heb. i. 5; Col. i. 18; Rev. i. 5. "God," says he, "rested from his works and sanctified a day of rest to himself as a signal of that rest, which day he also gave to his Church [in the wilderness] as a day of holy rest likewise. And if Christ thus rested from his own works, and the Holy Ghost says he did thus rest, he also hath sanctified a day to himself, as that in which he hath finished his work, and given it (that day) also to his Church to be an everlasting memento of his so doing, and that they should keep it holy for his sake."

In an *Exposition of the first Ten Chapters of Genesis*, Bunyan remarks on Gen. ii. 3, as follows:—

"The seventh day did signify two things: 1. Christ Jesus, who is as well the rest of the justice of God, as a rest for sinful man. 2. It was also a type of that glorious rest that saints shall have when the six days of this world are fully ended.

"For the first, the apostles make the Sabbath a shadow of Jesus Christ 'a shadow of things to come, but the body (or substance) *is* of Christ,' Col. ii. 17. And hence it is that he is so often said to be 'a rest' to the Gentiles, a glorious rest, and that he promiseth rest to such as cast their burthen upon him, Matt. xi. 29.

"The second also the apostle asserteth in that fourth chapter to the Hebrews, 'There remaineth therefore a rest,' or the keeping of a Sabbath, 'to the people of God,' ver. 9—read also ver. 4–11.

Which Sabbath, as I conceive, will be the seventh thousand of years which are to follow immediately after the world hath stood six thousand first: for as God was six days in the works of creation, and rested the seventh; so in six thousand years he will perfect his works and providences, that concern this world. And also he will finish the toil and travail of his saints, with the burthen of the beasts, and the curse of the ground, and bring all into rest for a thousand years. A day with the Lord is as a thousand years, wherefore this blessed and desirable time is also called 'a day,' 'a great day,' 'that great and notable day of the Lord,' Acts ii. 20; which shall end in the eternal judgment of the world. God hath held forth this by several other shadows, as the Sabbath of weeks, the Sabbath of years, and the great jubilee, which is to be the year 'after forty-nine years are expired,' Lev. xxv. 1–13." (*Works*, by Offor, ii. 424; or Stebbing's edition, iii. 377.)

Bunyan's treatise on the Seventh-day Sabbath is in the fourth volume of Stebbing's edition, p. 195.

It does not appear that he was a Sabbatarian in the proper sense of the term (see above, i. 415, 419, 420), but only that he believed Sunday to be the divinely appointed time when Christians were to assemble for worship. He thus, if I mistake not, agrees with Paley as to both institutions, as he certainly does with him and Milton in regard to *the Sabbath* (above, ii. 250–7, 47).

Page 86.—Thomas Chafie.

The first edition of Chafie's book was published in 1652, 4to, pp. 110. His design was partly to remove the scruples of the Seventh-day Baptists, and partly to meet the difficulty occasioned by the discovery of modern astronomers and travellers that it is impossible to keep the Sabbath in all parts of the world during the same twenty-four hours. See above, i. 462–3; and ii. 168. Some of his followers are mentioned in ii. 40, 45, 92, 168; and i. 463, *n.*

Page 107.—Campegius Vitringa.

See the references under the head of Spencer, above, p. 456. Holden's attempt, at p. 119 of his book, to refute Vitringa's opinion that rest was the sole appointed mode of "sanctifying" the Sabbath-day seems to me most feeble. He imports into the Fourth Commandment the dictates of "right reason" in regard to the fit manner of *spending* the day which that precept ordains to be "*set apart*" *from labour* in honour of Jehovah; and in replying to Vitringa's argument from the sabbatical year, he treats that institution as if the Sabbath appointed to be kept were a rest, not of the *land*, but of the *Jews*. He admits, however, that "the phraseology of the statutes on the subject is not absolutely inconsistent with Vitringa's opinion."

Page 132.—Sir Francis Grant.

This Scottish lawyer, who, from 1709 till his death in 1726, sat as a judge in the Court of Session with the title of Lord Cullen, published anonymously "A Short History of the Sabbath, containing some few Grounds for its Morality, and Cases about its Observance: With a brief Answer to or Anticipation of several Objections against both." (Edin. 1705; 4to. p. 17.)

Though called a *History*, it is but an ordinary plea for Sabbatarianism; the author referring for more detailed arguments to the works of Owen, Hughes, Warren, Young, and Brown, who, he says, "seem both to comprise and surpass any authors that went before them, either at home or abroad, particularly in explaining the nature of the Sabbath, so as to deduce its observance under the New Testament from the Old, and that not only by the morality of the fourth command, the very intrinsic reasons whereof do, upon our Saviour's resurrection, which was a rest from a New Creation that presupposed the Old, determine it from the seventh to the first day of the week; but likewise by opening up several prophecies, promises, and types, relating thereto, which made the change, being declaratory rather than statutory, to be rather supposed than to need an express sanction under Christianity, when God incarnate having raised a new world did rest from his labour of love, and thereby fixed the day thereof," &c.

There is a life of Sir Francis Grant in Chambers's *Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen*, ii. 528.

Page 137.—James Koelman.

The following particulars about Koelman are given by Dr Steven in his *History of the Scottish Church at Rotterdam* (Edin. 1833). "He was ejected from his charge at Sluis in Flanders, in consequence of refusing to observe the festival days and formularies of the Dutch Church. He appears to have been a very conscientious, worthy man; and when his pastoral connection with Sluis was at an end, he devoted himself to the composition as well as the translation of religious books, most of which he dedicated to his former flock. With the banished Scottish ministers [including John Brown of Wamphray, as mentioned above, p. 449] Mr Koelman was on an intimate footing, and was consulted by them in their correspondence with the States-General. He died at Utrecht, Feb. 6th, 1695." (Pp. 72, 73.) Dr Steven specifies several Scottish theological books translated by Koelman, but mentions neither his treatise on the Sabbath nor the similar work of Brown—a fact which seems to show that even in Rotterdam both treatises are so scarce that it was only after the publication of his History that Dr Steven became acquainted with either. As formerly stated, he brought with him to Edinburgh the copy of Koelman which is now in the College Library.

Page 159.—J. SMALL.

Small's tract is entitled "The Fourth Command of the Decalogue considered; and its moral and perpetual obligation asserted and vindicated from the cavils of its adversaries, and particularly of Philip Limborch. By J. S., a Presbyter of the Episcopal Church of Scotland." Edin. 1713; 4to, pp. 16.

Mr Small advocates the views of the Sabbath expressed in the articles of the Synod of Dort (above, i. 218).

The duty incumbent on Christians for the sanctification of the Sabbath (changed by Christ to Sunday) he represents as follows:—"*First*, a negative sanctification, whereby we are bound not to profane it by the doing of anything of our secular business in it. . . . . *Secondly*, There is a positive sanctification of the Lord's Day, which we are bound unto by virtue of this commandment, viz., the spending it in the sincere and conscientious performance of holy duties, and principally in the public worship of God; for it seems to be chiefly in order to this, that the negative sanctification of it before mentioned is commanded." (Pp. 12, 13.)

"But (as our Saviour says), 'the Sabbath being made for man and not man for the Sabbath,' the works of necessity and mercy are not only lawful, but continue to be necessary duties on that as well as any other day. For the same reason also, it is very lawful to refresh ourselves by a moderate and decent recreation, after the public worship of God is over; such as by walking in the fields, or solacing ourselves by a cheerful and mutual conversation at home in our houses: providing there be nothing that is immodest or indecent in it, nor too much time spent by it. And those who would go about to restrain this, are so far from advancing anything of true piety thereby, that they are truly enemies unto it; as not only encroaching upon our Christian liberty by a vain and hypocritical show of godliness, but also as tending by their indiscreet and unwarrantable zeal to drive men unto the other extreme." (P. 14.)

Page 172.—DR JOHN BATTELY.

Dr Battely's book is to be found in the British Museum. Its full title is, "The Original Institution of the Sabbath, and the Observation due to it, considered." (8vo, pp. 71.) He argues for a primeval law, obliging men to observe *one day in seven*, "whereas the law delivered from Mount Sinai directed the Jews *which* of the seven days they ought to observe as sacred, and tied them down to it, so long as their polity should remain." (P. 20.) He discusses at considerable length the question, "What is to be understood by sanctifying or hallowing of the Sabbath day," by "the keeping it holy," and by the "profanation" of it. In the Jewish law we read of the profanation of places, times, and things—the offence so named always bearing a relation to the

design for which the place, time, or thing was sanctified, set apart, or appropriated. If a place was appointed for certain exclusive purposes, or to have certain privileges, or if it was tabooed against the entrance of any but a certain class of persons, then the doing in it of any prohibited act, or the violation of the privilege, or the intrusion of any one forbidden to enter, was profanation of the sanctified place: thus, if the avenger followed a murderer into Kadesh and slew him (Josh. xx. 1–7), he profaned that sanctuary; and if a Gentile penetrated beyond the outer court of the Temple, he profaned the Temple. So, to eat on the annual day of atonement was to profane or break the Fast, as to work on it was to profane or break it as a Sabbath, which it also was; and hence the reproof given by Isaiah to those who, though perhaps refraining from working on it themselves, exacted the full tasks from their slaves, whose labour was not in this case, as in the law of the weekly Sabbath, expressly prohibited. (See Lev. xvi. 29–34; xxiii. 27–32; Numb. xxix. 7; and Isa. lviii. 3, correctly rendered.*) Of the profanation of *things* we have a good example in the case of the "holy anointing oil," to use which otherwise than in consecrating the priests was to profane it (Exod. xxx. 31–33); and Belshazzar flagrantly profaned the gold and silver vessels which had been carried from the Temple in Jerusalem, by using them at his great Babylonian feast. (Dan. v.) "If, therefore," as Mr Battely well argues, "the holy oil, or the perfume, was profaned when used upon any other account than they were originally designed for; and if the people of Israel did profane themselves when they observed not those particular laws by which they were sanctified, as being the distinction between them and all other nations; so also, to apply this to the case before us, it must necessarily signify, that the sanctifying the Sabbath consists in doing upon that day such things, and such things only,

* It will be admitted, I believe, by the best Hebrew scholars that the true (or at least a perfectly admissible) meaning of the verse is that given by Dr Ebenezer Henderson in his translation of Isaiah: "Behold! on your fast-day ye attend to business, and exact all your tasks;" instead of "Behold, in the day of your fast ye find pleasure, and exact all your labours." Dr H. observes that the use of the word "labour" in the corresponding member of the parallelism sufficiently shows that the Hebrew word signifies in this place not *pleasure* (in the sense of enjoyment), but *business*. "The meaning of the verse," he adds, "doubtless is, that though the pharisaical Jews would not themselves engage in manual labour, they did not scruple to make the most rigorous demands on the time and strength of those whom they employed, requiring the full amount of their daily task." In like manner, he translates the 13th verse as follows:—"If thou restrain thy foot on the Sabbath, *and do not thine own business* on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, and the holy day of Jehovah honourable; and honour it, not doing thine own ways, *nor attending to thine own business*, nor spending it in talk: then thou shouldst delight thyself in Jehovah; and I would cause thee to ride over the heights of the earth, and feed thee with the inheritance of Jacob thy father." (2d ed. p. 429.) See above, p. 454.

as shall be every way agreeable to the natural holiness or sacredness of it; that is, to its being thus sanctified by God, by being separated, distinguished, or set apart by him from the other common days of the week; and that *whatever action does not keep up and maintain such a distinction*, is a profanation of it." (P. 24.) The only distinction appointed in the commandment was, that whereas on six days the Jews might labour, on the seventh they were to rest. If they worked on the seventh day, they profaned the Rest; and, so far as Scripture informs us (unless the Puritan interpretation of Isa. lviii. 13, which Mr Battely adopts, be correct), in no other way could this be done.

Expressed in plain English, the Fourth Commandment, as given in Exod. xx. 8–11, stands as follows:—"Remember the Rest-day, to set it apart. Six days shalt (or mayest) thou labour and do all thy work; but the seventh day is a Rest to Jehovah thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy male slave, nor thy female slave, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates [*i. e.*, thy proselyte]. For in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore Jehovah distinguished (made eminent) the Rest-day, and set it apart."

Although the mode of *sanctifying* the Sabbath is very generally confounded with the mode of *spending the sanctified time*, the two ideas are entirely distinct, and ought always to be treated as such. The duty of the Jews to spend rationally and virtuously the weekly day of rest in honour of Jehovah, did not depend on the commandment enjoining the repose, but on the general rules of conduct which they received, and on those natural laws of God which no man, whether Jew or Gentile, can disobey with impunity, and for obedience to which there is in every country and at all times a rich and sure reward.

Even those who believe that the Decalogue is binding on Christians, admit that no other part of the Law of Moses is now in force. (See the *Westm. Conf.* ch. xix. § 3.) If, then, we are bound by the Fourth Commandment, and if resting is the only mode of sanctification of the Sabbath-day specified in it, are we bound *by that commandment* to do more than rest? Were the Jews themselves obliged *by it* to more? Could they reasonably suppose that something necessary for the sanctification of the day had been omitted in the very law appointing the sanctification?

Page 187.—Thomas Chubb.

Chubb's object in his Dissertation is similar to that of Chafie (above, i. 462–3; ii. 458); he tries to deliver the Seventh-day Baptists from the inconveniences of their position by means of the following among other arguments. "As the day," says he, "on which God ceased to create, was called the seventh day; so that name was applied to it, only on account of the six days in which God performed the work of creation that preceded it, the Lord's sabbath

immediately succeeded in order of time those six days, and therefore was called the seventh day with regard to them. And as the Lord's sabbath began at a particular point of time all over the world; so at that particular point of time, it must have been different with regard to day and night upon all the parts of it; that is, it must have been sunrising at one place, noontide at another, sunset at another, and so on different at all other places, according to their different situations on this globe, and according to the different denominations that the parts which day and night are usually divided into, and are distinguished by, whether it be that of watches, or hours, or minutes, &c. For example, suppose that at the point of time when the Lord's sabbath began, it was sunrising at London, and that the sun was in the equinox; then on all other parts of the globe the Lord's sabbath began so many degrees (dividing 24 hours into 360 parts) before or after sunrising, as each place is degrees of west or east longitude from the meridian of London. To which I may add, that those places which lie a certain number of degrees from, and are nearest to each pole, have neither sunrising nor sunsetting at two seasons of the year; at which seasons, when the heavenly bodies (by the interposition of clouds, or any other way) are eclipsed, it does not appear, that then there is any provision in nature for a common measure of time to them. From what I have observed, I think it must appear plain (to all who understand the subject I am treating of) that it must have been impossible for any of the inhabitants of this globe, at any time, to have known what minute, or even hour, whether of day or night, the Lord's sabbath began with them, at the particular place where they resided; and consequently it must have been impossible for them to have began their reckoning for a sabbath from it; which yet they must have known and done, if they would have kept the seventh day from the creation as the sabbath. This, I say, was impossible to be known or done, without a particular revelation from God; but no such divine revelation has been given that has come to our knowledge, and therefore, for any thing that appears to the contrary, all our species, in all ages, must have been perfectly ignorant and uncertain with regard to these things. And from hence also it plainly appears, how weak and vain the pretence is, of keeping the seventh day from the creation as a sabbath; that is, it is exceedingly weak to pretend to begin a reckoning for a sabbath from the creation, seeing it is impossible to be known whether, at the point of time in which the Lord's sabbath began, it was day or night at any particular place on the globe, and therefore it must be impossible for any of its inhabitants, at any particular place, to begin their reckoning for a sabbath from it." (Pp. 74–76.)

This, of course, is merely an *argumentum ad hominem;* for Chubb was no believer in the Hebrew cosmogony. Cornthwaite replied that the *seventh day of the week* is what the Seventh-day Baptists contend for. (See above, pp. 198, 248.)

Page 198.—Daniel Dobel.

Dobel's book, which Cornthwaite replies to, is entitled "The Seventh-Day Sabbath not obligatory on Christians." (Canterbury, 1739; 8vo, pp. 93.) He was a man of little culture.

Page 206.—James Fisher.

In 1753 there was published at Edinburgh a book entitled "The Assembly's Shorter Catechism Explained, by James Fisher and other ministers of the gospel." The exposition which it gives of the Assembly's doctrine of the Sabbath is highly esteemed by the Scottish Presbyterian Dissenters. The book has often been reprinted.

Page 268.—Paley.

The arguments of Paley against a primeval Sabbath are so fully discussed by Dwight, Wardlaw, Wilson, Hey of Leeds (*Tracts and Essays*, Lond. 1822), Gilfillan (pp. 473–486), and many other writers whose works are widely circulated, that it seems unnecessary to quote their replies, the substance of which has besides been already sufficiently indicated in the present work. (See especially i. 5 *n* †, 109, 113, 129, 193–202, 203, 208, 231–4, 239, 273–9, 287, 415, 419; ii. 82, 92–6, 127–9, 142–4, 176–8, 203, 329, 336.) The chief points maintained are—a primeval Sabbath-law, binding all men for ever; the universal use of weeks; the pre-eminence of the number seven; traces of Sabbath-keeping before the giving of the Law at Sinai, and by the Gentiles; the universal and perpetual obligation of the Decalogue; its confirmation by Christ and his apostles; Old Testament prophecies of a Christian literal Sabbath; and the divine appointment of Sunday as such in the New. It is worthy of remark, however, that although one of Paley's grounds—the existence of two discrepant editions of the Fourth Commandment (see above, p. 254)—is of vital importance in the argument, his opponents have, without a single exception, evaded or overlooked it. Even before Geology had compelled us to view the claim of Deut. v. 12–15 as better than that of Exod. xx. 8–11 (above, i. 432), nothing, it is plain, could be securely founded on the latter, so long as the former also held a place in the Pentateuch. As things *now* stand, all arguments from the Hebrew cosmogony, or from that edition of the commandment which refers to it, must be set aside, and the duty of reposing on Sunday must be advocated, not on Jewish, but on rational, moral, and Christian grounds. These are well able to sustain the venerable and beneficent institution; and I feel confident that as knowledge and wisdom increase, our weekly day of rest will not only be more and more highly esteemed, but be better and better employed.

INDEX OF TEXTS.

Gen. i. 1-31—I. 1, 437-9; II. 40, 41, 100, 200, 211, 327.
ii. 1-3—I. 3, 106 *n*, 107 *n*, 129, 167, 175, 201, 203, 214, 221, 231, 232, 233, 258, 290, 315, 317, 365, 377, 396, 402, 403, 425; II. 3, 8, 31, 37, 40, 44, 47, 48, 73, 83, 92, 127, 128, 146, 147, 193, 198, 218, 219, 243, 250, 251, 259, 329, 338, 356, 363.
iv. 3, . . I. 4; II. 103
vii. 1, . . . II. 203
4, . . I. 4; II. 40
10, . . . I. 4, 288
12, . . . II. 40
viii. 10-12, . . . I. 4, 288
22, . . . II. 40
xii. 8, . . . II. 103
xiii. 4, . . . II. 103
xiv. 18, . . . II. 103
xxvi. 5, . . . I. 107
24, . . . II. 40
xxviii. 17-22, . . II. 103
xxix. 25-30, I. 5, 288; II. 103
xxxi. 42, . . . II. 40
xli. 45, . . . II. 103
xlvii. 22, . . . II. 103
l. 10, . . . I. 6
Exod. iii. 1, . . . II. 103
vii. 25, . . . I. 107
xii. 2, . . . II. 41
15, . . . I. 107
17, . . . II. 110
42, . . . II. 40
xiii. 21, 22, . . II. 40
43, 44, . . II. 204
xiv. 8, . . . II. 227
xv. 25, . . . I. 478
26, . . . II. 158

Exod. xvi. 1-30—I. 129, 215, 220, 231, 233, 293, 347; II. 47, 48, 74, 105, 106, 116, 132, 250.
1, . . I. 6, 155, 432
5, . I. 6, 404; II. 112
22, . . I. 7; II. 218
23—I. 8, 232, 375, 418, 420; II. 48, 100, 112, 218, 222.
25, . . . I. 8, 233
26, . I. 8; II. 100, 194
27, . I. 8, 397; II. 194
29—I. 8, 457; II. 64, 110 *n* †, 221.
33-34, . I. 107; II. 47
xviii. 12, . . . II. 103
xix. 1-25, . I. 9, 227, 373
3-6, . . . I. 202
10, . . . I. 397
12, . . . I. 397
20, . . . I. 374
23, . . I. 397; II. 78
34, ... II. 40
xx. 1-26, . . . I. 11
2, I. 11, 202, 233, 424-5
7, . . . I. 3
8-11—I. 11, 106 *n*, 109 *n*, 137, 149, 152, 155, 168, 171, 185, 201, 203, 204, 208, 219, 220, 226, 227, 231, 232, 233, 234, 239, 315, 366, 372, 375, 377, 378, 395, 399, 400, 403-11, 432, 436, 449, 455, 478; II. 3, 35, 39, 48, 52, 84, 93, 100, 103, 128, 133, 142, 145, 157, 160, 164, 174, 193, 204, 212, 213, 219, 225, 229, 244, 254, 269, 325, 345,

Exod. xx. 8-11—II. 349, 363, 373, 393, 415, 443, 453, 462, 464.
13, . . I. 12, 366
19, . . I. 12, 372
xxiii. 12—I. 13, 222, 240; II. 49, 220, 225, 253, 304, 439, 454.
15, . . II. 166
16, . . II. 41
xxiv. 1-18, . I. 13, 372
xxv. 16, . . . I. 14
xxx. 31-33, . . II. 461
xxxi. 13—I. 15, 219, 220, 375, 378, 400, 401; II. 49, 50, 78, 103, 220, 298.
14—II. 15, 48, 49, 50, 110, 224, 225.
15—I. 15, 231, 420; II. 224, 225, 252.
16—I. 15, 220, 231; II. 63, 225, 253, 254.
17—I. 15, 231; II. 47, 51, 219, 220, 253, 254.
18, . I. 15, 371
xxxii. 7, 8, 15-19, I. 15, 371
xxxiv. 1-29—I. 16, 202, 269; II. 345.
21—I. 17, 141, 232, 359, 405-7; II. 48.
22, . . II. 41
xxxv. 1-3—I. 18, 215, 220, 418, 420; II. 48, 164, 222, 225, 351.
xl. 17-21, . . I. 18
Lev. iv. 22, 27, . . . I. 372
vi. 8-13, . . . II. 224
viii. 35, . . . II. 40
xi. 44, . . . II. 48
xvi. 29-34—I. 21 *n*, 199, 420; II. 461.
xviii. 4, 21, 39, . . I. 372
xix. 1-4, . . I. 19, 372, 375
18, . . . I. 433
30, . . I. 19; II. 330
xx. 8, . . . I. 372
26, . . . I. 19
xxii. 3, . . . I. 416
31, . . . I. 372
40, . . . II. 440
xxiii. 1-8—I. 19, 220, 457; II. 48, 79, 107, 127, 141, 166, 188, 229, 253, 382, 375, 457.
12, . . I. 171; II. 79
27-32—I. 20, 199, 415, 420; II. 40, 41, 461.
33-40, . . II. 79
xxiv. 8, . . I. 21, 168
Lev. xxv. 1-13, . . . II. 457
2-7, . I. 21, 420; II. 111
44-46, . . I. 161
xxvi. 2, . . . I. 375
30, . . . II. 78
33-35, . . I. 22
Numb. vi. 23, . . . II. 166
25, . . . II. 42
x. 10, . . . II. 439
35, . . . II. 276
xv. 30-36—I. 22, 133, 205, 251, 382, 397, 400, 401; II. 48, 221, 224, 227, 338.
xxviii. 3, 9, 24, 25—I. 23, 168, 261, 457; II. 79, 112, 127, 166, 188, 218, 224, 252, 382.
xxix 7, . I. 21 *n*; II. 461
xxxiii. 3, . . II. 40
Deut. iv. 1-14—I. 23, 202, 373, 477; II. 36.
20, . . . II. 103
v. 1-22, I. 24, 202, 372, 374
12—I. 25, 106 *n*, 109 *n*, 233, 375, 377, 386, 399, 418; II. 49, 100, 103, 145.
15—I. 25, 155, 220, 232, 366, 378, 386, 432, 436; II. 8, 11, 49, 110, 157, 194, 209, 213, 220, 225, 254, 304, 345, 373, 393, 415, 464.
22, . . I. 156; II. 173
24, . . . II. 61
vi. 5-9, . . I. 433; II. 229
vii. 6, . . . I. 26
ix. 7-11, 16, 17, I. 26; II. 129
x. 1-5, I. 27, 232; II. 174
18, 19, . . I. 433
xiv. 1, . . . II. 49
26, . . I. 397
xvii. 18, . . II. 228
xviii. 15-22, . . I. 434
xix. 11, . . I. 433
xxiii. 10-13, . I. 205; II. 97
14, . . . I. 397
xxvii. 1-8, . . I. 27, 397
xxix. 1, . . . II. 103
xxxi. 9-13—I. 28, 168; II. 108, 166, 204, 219, 228, 276.
24-26, . I. 29; II. 173
xxxiii. 1, 2, . . II. 42
4, . . I. 477
Josh. vi. 2-5, . I. 29, 220; II. 11
viii. 30-32, . . I. 30
xx. 7, I. 137; II. 78, 79, 461
Judges xiv. 12, . . I. 30; II. 103

1 Sam. xvi. 7, . . . II. 276
xix. 11, . . . II. 40
xxv. 31, . . . I. 377
1 Kings viii. 1, 6, 9, . . I. 30
xix. 18, . . II. 133
2 Kings iv. 22-23, . . I. 31; II. 113
xi. 5-7, . . . I. 31
xii. 10, . . . II. 166
xvi. 18, . . I. 31 *n*
xxii. 8-13, . . I. 31, 168
xxiii. 1, 2, . . I. 32
1 Chron. ix. 32, . . I. 32
xxiii. 31, . . I. 32
2 Chron. ii. 3, 4, . I. 33; II. 50
viii. 12, 13, . I. 33; II. 50
xvii. 7-9, . . I. 33
xxiii. 8, . . I. 31 *n*
xxxi. 3, . . II. 50
xxxiv. 14, . . I. 168
33, . . I. 261
xxxvi. 20, 21, I. 33; II. 48
Ezra vi. 16, . . . II. 84
vii. 6, . . . II. 108
Neh. v. 18, . . I. 215, 417
viii. 5, 6, . . . II. 319
9-12, 17, 18—I. 34, 397; II. 79, 108, 178, 195, 305, 306, 319.
ix. 3, . . . II. 319
13, 14—I. 35, 106 *n*, 232, 400; II. 48, 64, 108, 133, 252.
x. 28-33, . . I. 35; II. 48
xiii. 1, . . . II. 108
15-22—I. 36, 204, 231, 232, 233, 261, 397, 421; II. 48, 456.
Esth. ix. 19-22, . . II. 84, 178
Job i. 1-6, . I. 37; II. 103, 203
ii. 1, . . I. 37; II. 103, 203
13, . . . I. 37
Psal. viii. . . . II. 42
xxii. 29, . . . I. 360
xxxi. 16, . . . II. 42
xxxviii. 5, . . I. 349
xlii. 4, . . . I. 107
xlvi. 5, . . . I. 360
lix. 16, . . . I. 360
lxvii. 1, . . . II. 42
lxix. 22, . . . I. 368
lxxiv. 8, . . I. 38; II. 108
lxxxii. 6, . . . I. 149
lxxxiv. 11, . . II. 42
xcii. 1-4—I. 38, 232, 233, 261, 361, 368, 400; II. 166, 188.
civ. 22, 23, . . I. 206
cxviii. 19-26—I. 39, 106 *n*, 232; II. 457.
Psal. cxlvii. 19-20—I. 39, 202, 477; II. 36.
cxlviii. 20, . . I. 20
Eccles. iii. 1, . . . II. 454
x. 19, . . . I. 207
Isa. i. 10-17—I. 39, 129, 219, 317, 398; II. 127.
viii. 13, . . . I. 129
xxix. 13, . . . I. 398
xxx. 29, . I. 40, 397; II. 79
xxxiii. 22, . . . I. 372
xxxv. 8, . . . I. 379
l. 11, . . . I. 349
li. 5, 7, 16, . . . I. 434
lvi. 1-8—I. 40, 202, 231, 374, 400; II. 50, 64, 109, 119, 127, 166, 188, 453.
lviii. 2, . . II. 454, 461
13, 14—I. 41, 106, 171, 206, 231, 234, 270, 375, 377, 397, 398, 399, 400, 416, 425, 428; II. 85, 111, 119, 127, 159, 164, 207, 338, 454-5, 461.
lix. 21, . . . I. 434
lxiii. 10, 12, . . I. 396
lxv. 17-19, . . . I. 41
lxvi. 18-24, I. 41, 220, 233; II. 109
Jer. vii. 21-23, . . . I. 42
xiv. 14, 15, . . I. 434
xvii. 20-27—I. 42, 232, 234, 375, 397, 400, 402; II. 20, 48, 50, 110.
xxii. 7, . . . II. 78
li. 27, 28, . . . II. 78
Lam. i. 7, . . I. 43, 148, 232, 419
ii. 6, ... I. 44
Ezek. xviii. 5-9, . . . II. 255
xx. 10-13—I. 44, 204, 232, 375, 396, 400, 401, 416; II. 47, 49, 63, 195, 252, 253, 298.
18-20—I. 44, 232; II. 49, 63, 298.
25, 26, . . II. 2
xxii. 8, I. 44, 204, 375, 400
26, I. 44, 204, 232, 233
xxiii. 36-39—I. 45, 204, 234, 375, 400.
xliv. 23, 24, . . I. 45, 375
xlvi. 1-6, . . I. 45, 375
Dan. vii. 23-25, . . . I. 46
Hos. ii. 11, I. 46, 397; II. 79, 439
Joel ii. 15, . . . II. 78
Amos viii. 4-8, . . I. 47, 232, 233
Micah vi. 8, . . . I. 433
Zech. vii. 5, . . . II. 85
xiii. 3, . . . I. 434
xiv. 16, . . . II. 209

Mal. i. 6, ... I. 372
11, . . . II. 48
13, . . . I. 233
ii. 7, . . . I. 372
iv. 2, . . . II. 42
The Apocrypha, I. 115, 421; II. 108
Matt. iii. 13-15, . . I. 47; II. 169
iv. 23, . . . II. 271
v. 17, 18—I. 48, 167, 231, 245, 372; II. 62, 95, 104, 144, 453.
23, 24, . . I. 53 *n*
vi. 2, . . . II. 180
5-18—I. 48; II. 271, 282, 288, 317.
25, . . . II. 60
34, . . . II. 40
vii. 21, . . . I. 398
ix. 13-15, . I. 49; II. 170
35, . . . II. 271
xi. 29, 30, . II. 272, 457
xii. 1-14—I. 49, 126, 167, 180, 204, 231, 233, 397, 405, 418; II. 170.
2, . . II. 113, 399
5, I. 349, 380, 397; II. 224
7, I. 221; II. 178, 374, 402
8—I. 106, 221; II. 113, 272, 374, 457.
11, 12, . . II. 114
xiii. 3, 4, . . II. 271
xiv. 19, . . . II. 201
23, . . . II. 270
xv. 1-9—I. 50, 237, 372, 385, 398; II. 144.
36, . . . II. 201
xvi. 21, . . . I. 222
xvii. 2, . . . II. 288
xviii. 19, 20—I. 51; II. 196, 274, 288.
xix. 8, ... I. 51
13, . . . II. 288
16-22, I. 51, 372; II. 268
xxi. 14, . . . II. 271
28-31, . . I. 398
xxii. 37, . . I. 433
40, . . I. 371
xxiii. 1-33—I. 53, 245; II. 144, 272, 288.
xxiv. 20—I. 54, 160, 169, 211; II. 3, 31, 62, 83, 100, 117, 119, 167, 450.
xxvi. 36, . . . II. 270
xxvii. 45, . . II. 41
51, . . I. 406
xxviii. 1, I. 54; II. 41, 374
19, 20, . I. 55; II. 196
xxxii. 34-40, . I. 52, 233
Mark i. 21-34, I. 56, 397; II. 91, 113
ii. 23-28—I. 57, 167, 221, 222, 397, 405, 406; II. 3, 50, 61, 113, 170, 171, 197, 338, 356, 374, 399.
iii. 1-6—I. 58, 271, 380, 397; II. 50.
vi. 1-5, . . . I. 58
46, . . . II. 270
viii. 6, 19, . . II. 201
30, . . . I. 222
ix. 2, . . . II. 288
x. 16, . . . II. 288
17, . . . II. 268
xi. 27, . . . II. 271
xiv. 32, . . . II. 270
xv. 42, . . I. 108, 232
xvi. 1-20, . I. 59; II. 43
xxiii. 14, . . II. 273
Luke i. 74, 75, . . I. 233
ii. 46, . . . II. 271
iv. 15, 16—I. 60, 233; II. 113, 188, 271, 275, 287.
31-35, . I. 60; II. 188
38-44, I. 61, 397; II. 91
v. 16, . . . II. 270
vi. 1-11—I. 61, 241, 380, 397; II. 19, 170, 356, 457.
12, . . . II. 270
viii. 10, . . . II. 211
ix. 18, . . . II. 270
28, 29, . . II. 288
x. 25-28, . . I. 63
xi. 1, . . . II. 288
37-44, . . I. 63
xiii. 10-17—I. 64, 180, 397, 417; II. 58, 114, 170, 178.
xiv. 1-12—I. 64, 180, 204, 216, 243, 397, 405; II. 50, 79, 130, 178, 219, 304, 305, 374, 399.
xvi. 16, 17, . I. 65, 385
xviii. 12, . . I. 377
18-22, . . I. 65
xix., . . . II. 271
xx. 1, . . . II. 271
xxi. 3, . . . II. 271
37, 38, . I. 60 *n*, 65
xxii. 19, 20, . . II. 196
41, . . . II. 270
xxiii. 50-56, I. 66, 232; II. 209
xxiv. 1-53—I. 66, 137; II. 53, 274
John i. 17, . . . I. 108
iii. 11, 12, . . . II. 211
iv. 6, . . . I. 415
21-24—I. 69, 237; II. 48, 88, 195, 271, 272, 282, 288.

JOHN v. 8, 9, 10—I. 70, 167, 180, 222, 243, 380, 397; II. 19, 114, 170, 374.
17—I. 71, 350, 367, 432; II. 21, 374.
24, . . . I. 251
39, . . . I. 433
63, . . . II. 211
vii. 14-24—I. 71, 60 *n*, 167, 220, 380, 397; II. 50, 224.
viii. 20, . . . I. 60 *n*
34, . . . I. 367
56, . . . I. 106 *n*
ix. 1-16, . I. 72, 206; II. 50
x. 22, . . . II. 64
xiv. 21, 23, . . I. 374
xv. 5, . . . I. 349
xvii. . . II. 270, 287
xviii. 20, . . . I. 60 *n*
xx. 1, 2, . I. 73, 137; II. 43
19—I. 73, 111 *n*; II. 18, 199, 255, 263, 292, 457.
26—I. 73, 111 *n*; II. 18, 119, 199, 255, 263, 292, 374, 457.
xxi. 1-5, . . I. 74; II. 53
ACTS i. 1-9, . . . I. 75
14, . . . II. 289
24, . . II. 275, 289
ii. 1-4—I. 76, 129; II. 18, 19, 118, 199, 262, 336, 394, 457.
5, . . . II. 205
15, . . . II. 41
41-47—I. 76; II. 18, 196, 266, 275, 289.
iii. 1-11, . I. 76, 60 *n*, 275, 289
iv. 1, . . . I. 60 *n*
10, 11, . . I. 232; II. 457
24, . . II. 275, 289
v. 42, . . I. 60 *n*
vi. 4, . . . II. 289
6, . . II. 275, 289
8-15, . . . I. 77
vii. 37-50, . . . I. 77
viii. 14-17, . . II. 392
27, . . . II. 205
38, . . . II. 129
ix. 19, 20, . . I. 78; II. 275
x. 2, 22, . . II. 205, 275
9, . . . II. 275
25-35, . . . I. 78
xi. 1-18, . . . I. 79
29, . . . II. 295
xii. 5, . . . II. 289
12, . . . II. 289
xiii. 3, . . II. 275, 289
5, . . I. 80; II. 275
ACTS xiii. 14-48—I. 80, 158; II. 100, 113, 144, 188, 205, 275, 457.
xiv. 1, . . I. 81; II. 275
17, . . . I. 79 *n*
xv. 1-31—I. 81, 177, 343; II. 144, 205, 254, 255, 296, 326, 380.
21—I. 221, 223; II. 80, 113, 114, 166, 188, 253.
xvi. 1-4, . . . I. 83, 102 *n*
13—I. 84, 158; II. 54, 113, 188
xvii. 1-25—I. 84, 79 *n*, 158; II. 113, 260, 201, 275.
26, . . . I. 258
28, . . . I. 79 *n*
xviii. 4—I. 85, 158; II. 54, 113, 201, 275.
18-21, . . I. 85; II. 382
xix. 1, 5-10, 17-20—I. 85, 99 *n*; II. 392.
32, . . . II. 129
xx. 6-7—I. 85, 111 *n*, 129, 134, 161, 166, 177, 215, 231, 233, 234, 237, 247; II. 18, 31, 53, 84, 118, 119, 120, 154, 158, 177, 182, 200, 255, 263, 292-4, 331, 338, 348, 369, 374, 382, 394, 452-3, 457.
36, . . . II. 289
xxi. 4, 5, . . . I. 87
9, . . . II. 289
17-30, . . I. 87; II. 382
xxv. 4-8—I. 88, 343; II. 63, 144, 382.
xxvii. 35, . . . II. 201
xxviii. 17, 18—I. 89, 343; II. 63, 144, 382.
ROM. i. 18, . . . I. 79
ii. 12, . . . II. 94
13-15, . I. 79 *n*, 89, 232, 388
29, . . . I. 197
iii. 31, . . . II. 96
vi. 4, . . . I. 378
14, . . . II. 96
vii. 6, 7, . . . I. 89
viii. 21, . . . II. 273
x. 5, . . . I. 232, 472
xi. 17, . . . II. 94, 98
xii. 12, . . . I. 369
xiii. 1, 2, . . . II. 196
8-10, . I. 90, 373; II. 95
xiv. 1-6—I. 90, 127, 165, 202, 210, 217, 343, 404; II. 3, 16, 22, 24, 31, 51, 67, 147, 184, 189, 193, 200, 226, 327, 343, 374, 376, 450.
7-23, . . I. 90, 217
xv. 30, . . . II. 290

1 Cor. i. 7, 8, . . . I. 106 *n*
v. 4, . . . I. 237
5, . . . I. 106 *n*
8, . . . II. 109
vii. 18, 19, . . I. 92, 374
37-40, . . . II. 161
viii. 5, . . . I. 197
8, . . . I. 261
ix. 19-23, I. 92, 168; II. 63
x. 31, . . I. 93; II. 130
xi. 13, . . . II. 290
18-20, . I. 237; II. 348
xiv. 13-17, 23, . . II. 290
xv. 3-8, . . . I. 93
33, . . . I. 79 *n*
xvi. 1-4—I. 93, 111 *n*, 129, 134, 137, 138, 161, 166, 177, 223, 231, 233, 267, 376, 407; II. 3, 18, 31, 43, 53, 84, 118, 119, 120, 154, 158, 176, 209, 255, 264, 292, 294, 295, 331, 332, 369, 374, 382, 394, 452-3, 457.
19, . . . II. 129
2 Cor. iii. 1-18, . . . I. 94; II. 381
v. 17, . . . II. 273
viii. . . . II. 130
Gal. ii. 1-21, . . I. 95, 251, 365
iii. 19, . . . I. 372
23-29, . I. 97, 202, 385, 477
iv. 8-11—I. 97, 127, 135, 143, 165, 177, 202, 210, 343, 376, 404, 424; II. 12, 16, 24, 50, 67, 71, 147, 177, 189, 193, 200, 296, 327, 343, 374, 376, 450.
21-31, . . . I. 98
v. 1-6, . . I. 98; II. 272
vi. 15, . . . I. 374
Eph. ii. 11-22, . I. 99, 385; II. 94
iv. 4, . . . II. 196
22, . . . I. 378
v. 8, . . . I. 378
vi. 1-3, . . I. 99; II. 95
Philip. i. 9, 10, . . I. 106 *n*
ii. 16, . . . I. 106 *n*
iii. 2-6, . I. 108; II. 63, 382
Col. i. 18, . . . II. 457
ii. 8-15, . . . I. 100
16, 17—I. 101, 127, 135, 137, 165, 177, 202, 210, 223, 343, 370, 376, 386, 410, 440; II. 3, 16,
Col. ii. 16, 17—II. 24, 29, 31, 50, 54, 67, 100, 104, 109, 147, 189, 192, 193, 200, 209, 226, 254, 327, 343, 350, 375, 376, 450, 457.
1 Thess. iv. 11, . . . I. 380
v. 2, . . . I. 106 *n*
2 Thess. ii. 1, 2, . . I. 106 *n*
iii. 1, 2, . . II. 290
1 Tim. ii. 1, 2, 8, . II. 290, 320
iv. 8, . . . I. 108
2 Tim. ii. 2, . . . II. 196
iii. 15-17, . . I. 102, 385
Titus i. 12, . . . I. 79 *n*
Heb. i. 5, ... II. 457
iii. 12, 13, . . I. 102, 401
iv. 1-11—I. 102, 246, 365, 379, 401, 402, 432; II. 3, 23, 36, 50, 52, 109, 118, 119, 170, 259, 338, 374, 450, 457.
vi. 2, . . II. 50, 392
vii. 11-16, . . I. 103, 245, 385
19, . . . I. 477
viii. 6, 7, . . I. 103, 477
13, . . I. 102 *n*, 103
ix. 10, . . . II. 102
x. 1, . . I. 376; II. 106
24, 25, . I. 104, 237; II. 196
xi. 4, . . . II. 103
xii. 18-24, . . . I. 104
xiii. 17, . . . II. 196
James i. 26, 27, I. 104, 381, 398; II. 177
ii. 2, . . I. 223; II. 320
8-11, . I. 105, 438; II. 95
iv. 13, 14, . . II. 40
v. 14, . . . II. 290
1 Pet. i. 15-19, . . . I. 238
ii. 13, 14, . . II. 196
16, . . . II. 381
iii. 7, . . . II. 290
2 Pet. ii. 5, . . . I. 108
iii. 10, . . . I. 106 *n*
1 John v. 2, 3, . . I. 105, 172, 373
Rev. i. 5, ... II. 457
10—I. 105, 111 *n*, 166, 194, 215, 231, 247, 376; II. 18, 53, 84, 118, 119, 145, 154, 209, 256, 265, 292, 348, 374, 375, 450, 453, 457.
iv. 2, . . . II. 375
xi. 1, 2, 13, . . II. 266

INDEX

OF

NAMES AND SUBJECTS.

ABBOT, George, i. 193, 476, 441; ii. 29.
Abendana, Isaac, ii. 132; i. 395.
Aberdeen, i. 188.
Abingdon, Earl of, ii. 238.
Abyssinians, i. 343, 346, 459; ii. 419.
Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, i. 241. *See* Statutes.
Adams, William, ii. 417; quoted, i. 426; ii. 431.
Addison, Joseph, ii. 155, 286.
Adkin, Lancaster, ii. 248.
Æschylus quoted, i. 281.
Agapæ, i. 216, 335; ii. 226, 265, 386.
Agatharcides, i. 293.
Agellius, i. 224.
Agnew, Sir Andrew, ii. 337, 339; i. 387; Memoirs of, ii. 341; Letter to, 359.
——— David C., ii. 347.
——— John H., ii. 415.
Agricultural labour, i. 17, 133, 141, 149, 171, 257, 358-9, 405, 407, 421; ii. 223.
Aikin, John, i. 225; ii. 270, 278.
Albaspinus, Gabriel, i. 153.
Albert de Broglie, Prince, i. 357.
Alcuin, i. 123.
Alexander, L., ii. 443.
——— William L., ii. 338.
Alexandrian Church, i. 342, 345-350.
——— Jews, i. 281-3, 241, 293, 342-3, 346.
Alfonsus, Petrus, i. 459.
Alford, Henry, ii. 374.
Allegorical teaching, ii. 108, 211.
Allen, John, ii. 443.
Allix, Peter, ii. 81; i. 476.
Almsgiving, i. 93, 335; ii. 181, 295. *See* Corinth.
Alsop, Mrs Ann, ii. 409.
Alting (Altingius), James, ii. 6, 73, 139, 141; i. 476.
Ambrose, i. 123; ii. 4.
America, i. 236, 249, 268, 360, 391; ii. 32, 81, 269, 307, 410-437.
American aborigines did not use the week, ii. 114.
——— Biblical Repository, ii. 416.
——— Quarterly Review, ii. 414.
——— Sabbath Tract Society, i. 237, 267; ii. 57, 167, 418.
——— Theological Review, ii. 417.
——— Tract Society, ii. 417.
Ames (Amesius), William, ii. 49; i. 203, 218.
Amner, Richard, ii. 210; i. 394, 395.
Amphilochius, i. 308.
Amusement, need of, ii. 308; public, on Sunday, ii. 237, 240, 247, 258, 324. *See* Recreation; Sports.
Anabaptists, i. 205; ii. 419.
Analogy of the Lord's-day to the Sabbath, i. 199, 203, 227, 459; ii. 55, 387, 390.
Anderson, John, i. 437.
Andrewes, Lancelot, i. 153, 297, 304, 327-30, 431.
Anglo-Saxon laws, i. 458; ii. 187.
Antinomians, i. 250, 373-4, 387, 388.
Anti-Sabbath Convention at Boston, U.S., ii. 417, 423-31.
Apeleutherus, ii. 367.

Apocalypse, authorship of, ii. 265, 266.
Apocrypha, i. 115, 117.
Apollonius, William, ii. 139.
Apostles, their practice and doctrine in regard to the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, i. 112, 158, 161, 166, 177, 198, 205, 215; ii. 8, 29, 31, 35, 53, 63 *n*, 82, 144, 154, 157, 163, 189, 190, 230, 244, 255, 259, 263, 274, 289, 292, 318, 357, 369, 370, 376, 379, 382, 385, 386, 388, 392, 394; is their example law to us? i. 475; ii. 35, 253-4, 318, 333, 386.
Apostolical Constitutions, i. 319, 348.
Aquinas, Thomas, i. 125, 149, 370.
Archery, i. 446, 471.
Aretius, i. 286.
Aristobulus, i. 224, 275, 277, 282, 293; ii. 8.
Ark of the covenant, i. 14, 18, 27, 28, 29, 30; ii. 173.
Armenians, ii. 419.
Arminians, i. 250.
Arminius, James, ii. 139.
Arnold, Professor, of Franeker, ii. 72, 448.
——— Thomas, ii. 349; quoted, i. 139, 306, 392; ii. 365; referred to, i. 428; answer to, ii. 339.
Arthur, William, ii. 345, 410.
Articles of Religion, Irish, i. 255, 259, 260, 262; of Synod of Dort —*see* Dort.
Ascension of Jesus, i. 60, 69, 76, 132, 316, 333; ii. 53.
Asceticism, i. 434, 448, 449; ii. 340, 367, 381, 391, 399, 403.
Aspinwall, i. 255, 479.
Assemblies for worship, i. 110. *See* Worship; Lord's-day; Sabbath; Synagogue.
Assembly of Divines. *See* Westminster Assembly.
Assyrians had the week, i. 114.
Athanasius, i. 122, 118, 196, 257, 311, 340, 346, 363; ii. 4, 55, 56, 335.
Atkinson, H. K., ii. 395.
Atonement, Jewish annual day of, i. 20, 199, 397; ii. 460.
Augsburg Confession, i. 130, 172, 410; ii. 136, 141.
Augusti, J. C. W., ii. 438; i. 297.
Augustine, i. 123, 135, 137, 143, 177, 178, 216, 217, 257, 327, 366-9, 398, 421, 456; ii. 4, 18, 67, 141, 155, 160, 164.
Augustus Cæsar, i. 177; ii. 180.
Aylmer, Bishop, i. 127; ii. 371.

Babylonian festivals, i. 289.
Bähr, K. C. W. F., ii. 438.
Baillie, Robert, i. 229; quoted, 230.
Bailly, Mons., ii. 356.
Bakers, ii. 337.
Ball, Richard, ii. 343.
Bampfield, Francis, ii. 39, 57.
——— Thomas, ii. 86, 87, 91, 99, 200.
Bancroft, Archbishop, i. 264.
Bannerman, Henry, ii. 337, 22, 259, 261, 338 *n*, 433; i. 125, 139.
Banquets, public, on Sunday in Scotland, i. 467, 473.
Baptist Magazine, ii. 410.
Baptists. *See* Seventh-day Baptists.
Barbauld, Anna Lætitia, ii. 278, 287, 321.
Barbers, Sunday work of, i. 474.
Barclay, Robert, ii. 70, 350, 450.
Barker, Peter, i. 164.
Barklay, John, i. 165, 195, 197, 209; ii. 121.
Barnabas, i. 119, 125, 308, 315, 319; ii. 108, 300, 335, 357.
Barrett, W. G., ii. 315.
Barrington, Lord, ii. 205.
Barrow, Isaac, ii. 63; i. 394, 399, 419.
Barter, W. B., ii. 339.
Barwick, Dr, i. 425-6.
Basil, i. 122; ii. 4.
Basnage referred to, ii. 456.
Bates, Stewart, ii. 342.
Bathing on the Sabbath, i. 240; on the Lord's-day, 188, 266; ii. 430.
Battely, John, ii. 172, 460; i. 427.
Baumgarten referred to, ii. 114.
Baxter, Richard, ii. 28; quoted, i. 193, 228, 390, 392, 461; referred to, i. 125, 179, 197, 244, 249, 311, 370, 386, 394, 476, 479; ii. 16, 116, 179, 184, 209, 210, 304, 320, 388, 393; answer to, 36.
Baylee, John T., ii. 337, 341, 343, 410.
Bear-baiting, i. 426, 451; ii. 455.
Beasts, the Sabbath with reference

to, i. 11, 25, 149, 380, 417; ii. 65, 68, 169, 220, 225, 250, 303.
Beausobre, Isaac de, ii. 162; i. 120, 394.
Becon, Thomas, i. 138.
Beds in the East, i. 70; case of the man ordered by Jesus to carry his bed on the Sabbath-day, 70, 71, 222; ii. 19, 50, 114.
Bede, Venerable, i. 124, 167, 369-70, 476; ii. 9.
Bedford, Arthur, ii. 175, 45, 203.
Believer, scriptural meaning of the word, ii. 291.
Belknap, Jeremy, ii. 269.
Bells, ringing of, i. 147, 149, 188.
Bellarmine, Cardinal, i. 151, 202, 412, 424; ii. 93.
Bellows, Henry W., ii. 315.
Belsham, Thomas, ii. 350.
Ben, Mr, ii. 39.
Benjamin, S. A., ii. 433.
Benson, Dr, ii. 205, 297.
Bentley, John, ii. 367.
Bernard, Joshua L., ii. 107, 110, 111, 129.
—— Nicholas, i. 179, 199, 214, 255, 256, 262, 479.
—— Richard, i. 203, 247, 457.
—— St, i. 456, 469.
Berwick, salmon-fishers at, ii. 106.
Bethesda, miracle at pool of, i. 70, 222; ii. 19, 50, 114.
Beveridge, Bishop, i. 281.
—— Henry, i. 407.
Beza, Theodore, i. 134, 172, 179, 202, 269, 461; ii. 386.
Bialloblotzki, i. 394.
Bianconi, Mr, ii. 169.
Bible the rule of faith and worship, i. 306, 311-12, 345, 364; ii. 369; corruption of the original text of, i. 269; ii. 24; interpretation of, 162, 197, 214, 278, 290, 356.
Biblicus, ii. 348.
Bibliotheca Sacra, ii. 416, 438.
Bickersteth, Edward, ii. 341, 342.
Bignonius, i. 315.
Bingham, Joseph, ii. 152; i. 125, 297; ii. 155.
Bishops, authority of, i. 410.
Black, Peter Young, ii. 341.
—— W. H., ii. 80.
Bless, meaning of the word so translated in the Fourth Commandment, i. 397 *n*, 402; ii. 356.
Blomfield, C. J., ii. 334, 337.
Blood, prohibition of eating of, i. 83; ii. 326.
Blue Monday, ii. 217.
Blunt, J. J., i. 312, 348.
Boetius, i. 218.
Bohemia, ii. 202.
Bohlen, Von, i. 113.
Böhmer, i. 297, 305.
Bolland, William, ii. 330.
Bolton, Robert, ii. 206.
Book of Sports. *See* Sports.
Botanic Gardens, ii. 368, 407, 444.
Bound, Nicolas, i. 145, 418, 235, 247, 248, 285, 423; ii. 29, 308, 424.
Bowling, i. 446, 451, 469.
Bowman, Eddowes, ii. 348.
Bownd. *See* Bound.
Brabourne, Theophilus, i. 157, 162, 197, 200, 215, 248, 443; ii. 6; answers to, i. 167, 194, 195, 200, 240, 246.
Braithwaite, J. B., ii. 336.
Bramhall, John, i. 203, 139, 476; ii. 372; quoted, i. 422; ii. 388.
Bray, Dr, i. 264.
Brayne, John, i. 245.
Bread, breaking of, i. 76, 86; meaning of the phrase in Acts xx. 7, ii. 182, 200, 201, 293.
Breitingerus, J. J., ii. 139.
Brentius, i. 166, 172.
Brerewood, Edward, i. 159, 161, 442; ii. 29, 35; answers to, i. 194, 240.
Breweries, ii. 323, 361.
Brewster, Rev. Mr, Nova Scotia, ii. 437.
Bridges, James, ii. 340.
Bright, George, ii. 455.
British and Foreign Evangelical Review, i. 352, 362, 409, 438; ii. 416, 417.
British Controversialist, ii. 394.
British Critic, ii. 333, 414; i. 120.
British Museum, ii. 364, 368, 397, 399, 400.
British Quarterly Review, ii. 166, 345, 357, 378, 442.
Broad, Thomas, i. 156, 240, 439; ii. 29.
Brodie, George, i. 448, 451.
Brook, Benjamin, i. 151, 160, 193, 207, 214, 249.

Brown, James Baldwin, ii. 359, 397.
——— J. B., ii. 418.
——— J. Newton, ii. 416.
——— John, of Wamphray, ii. 140, 448, 458, 459.
——— John, of Haddington, ii. 248.
——— Samuel, ii. 394.
Browne, John W., ii. 417, 424.
——— Moses, ii. 206.
Bruce, John, ii. 340.
Bruckner, I., ii. 319, 321.
Brunsman, John, ii. 140; i. 318.
Bryan, Matthew, ii. 81.
Bucer, Martin, i. 166; ii. 54.
Buck's Theological Dictionary, i. 241.
Buddeus, John Francis, i. 226; ii. 136.
Buddhists, i. 289.
Bullinger, Henry, i. 132, 166, 172, 203, 428.
Bunsen, Chevallier, i. 125; ii. 355.
Bunyan, John, ii. 80, 456.
Burdens, carrying of, on the Sabbath, i. 36, 43, 70; ii. 20.
Burder, Henry Forster, ii. 336.
Burgh, William, ii. 331, 332.
Burke, Edmund, ii. 307.
Burleigh, C. C., ii. 424.
Burman, Francis, ii. 6, 10, 119, 138, 448, 449.
Burmese feasts, i. 289.
Burnet, Gilbert, ii. 156; i. 312.
——— Thomas, ii. 176, 211.
Burnside, Robert, ii. 409, 410, 261.
Burrow, Sir James, ii. 210.
Burton, Dr E., i. 123; ii. 18.
——— Henry, i. 465; ii. 140; answer to, *ib.*
——— J. H., referred to, i. 231.
Butler, Samuel, i. 228.
Buxtorf, John, sen., i. 157; ii. 180, 305, 319, 320.
——— John, jun., i. 269.
Byfield, Nicholas, i. 159.
——— Richard, i. 160, 188, 194, 265, 442.

Cabs, ii. 343, 363, 406.
Cæsarius Arelatensis, ii. 155.
Cajetan referred to, ii. 78.
Calendar, Roman, i. 278, 285, 287, 324; of other nations, 114, 287; French Revolutionary, ii. 321-3.
Callimachus, i. 224, 253, 276, 281, 283.
Calmet, Augustin, ii. 175.
Calvin, John, i. 127, 178, 209, 382-409; quoted, 3, 285, 384-409, 411; referred to, 113, 203, 204, 364, 423, 461, 466, 467, 476; ii. 5, 54, 72, 73, 81, 95, 121, 202, 350, 352, 359.
Calvinism, ii. 286.
Cameron, C. R., ii. 336.
Campbell, Geo., i. 4, 50, 57, 61, 86; ii. 78, 113.
Canaanites not reproached for Sabbath-breaking, i. 422.
Canals, traffic on, ii. 334, 335, 340, 343, 416.
Candlish, R. S., ii. 345, 410; i. 266; Letters to, ii. 352, 354.
Canons of the Church of England, i. 144, 171, 412.
Canterbury, the present Archbishop of, i. 435-6.
Capes, J. M., ii. 407, 410.
Capital punishment of Sabbath-breaking, i. 15, 18, 22, 251-2, 421; ii. 60, 69, 219, 224, 225, 227, 252.
Cappellus, Louis, i. 268, 476.
Card-playing, ii. 206, 258, 335.
Carlow, George, ii. 167.
Carriers, ii. 416. *See* Canals.
Carrington, James, ii. 234.
Cartwright's Catechism, i. 260.
Case, Thomas, ii. 46.
Castlereagh, Lord, ii. 431.
Catechisms:—Becon's, i. 138; Belgian, ii. 5; Bellarmine's, i. 152, 424; Calvin's (or Geneva), i. 128, 466; Cartwright's, i. 260; Cranmer's, i. 135; Church of England, i. 139, 412, 413, 425; ii. 104, 173, 336, 347, 349; Hammond's, i. 269; Heidelberg, ii. 5; Luther's, i. 126, 384; Paris, i. 424; Trent, 371, 387, 396, 412; Westminster Larger, i. 231, 200, 230, 235, 260; ii. 175, 380, 381, 464; Westminster Shorter, i. 232, 156, 197, 214, 231, 351, 391, 395, 420, 466; ii. 45, 81, 87, 118, 128, 152, 243, 312, 380, 381, 452.
Cathedral services, ii. 272.
Cattle, rest of, on the Sabbath, i. 11, 25, 149, 380; ii. 65, 68, 169, 220, 225, 250, 303; work for comfort of, i. 417.

Cave, William, ii. 54, 154; i. 334.
Cawdrey, Daniel, i. 227 *n*, 237, 226, 245, 247, 265, 319, 332, 350, 395, 413, 441, 442, 443, 464; ii. 29, 138, 174.
Censorinus, i. 224, 291.
Ceremonial worship, bad effects ascribed to, ii. 276; subordinate to moral duties, i. 40, 50, 180, 405-6; ii. 171, 178, 230, 402.
Ceremonies, Jewish, abrogation of, i. 131, 375-6, 384, 455.
Chadwick, Jabez, ii. 418.
Chafie, Thomas, ii. 86, 45, 92, 168, 458, 462 *n*; i. 462.
Chaldeans used the week, i. 278.
Challis, James, i. 438.
Chalmers, Thomas, ii. 340, 78, 325 *n*.
Chambers, Mr, of Clonford, i. 179.
——— Robert, i. 236, 249, 315.
Chandler, Samuel, ii. 207, 213; i. 394, 398.
Channing, William E., quoted, ii. 314, 352.
Charity, works of, on the Sabbath, i. 111, 133, 180, 213, 216, 230, 233, 405, 417; ii. 26, 50, 181, 361, 445.
Charlemagne, i. 359.
Charles I., i. 163, 444, 174, 197, 227, 271; ii. 123, 124, 131, 332, 336, 442.
——— II., ii. 233, 302, 448.
Charlesworth, John, ii. 269.
Chazan, ii. 319, 320.
Cheerfulness, characteristic of the Jewish Sabbath, i. 176, 206-7, 241, 243, 294; ii. 19, 79, 112, 164, 219; of the Lord's-day, i. 216, 241, 434; ii. 33, 207; of Christianity, ii. 247, 314.
Chemnitz, Martin, referred to, i. 166, 398.
Chester, Mary, i. 431.
Chevallier, Temple, i. 118, 119, 120, 121, 284, 335.
Children, punishment of, under the Mosaic law, i. 391; Sunday employments of, i. 242, 414, 434; ii. 325.
Chinese, i. 114, 287, 289; ii. 356.
Chirol, J. L., ii. 348.
Christian Church guided by principles, ii. 370.
——— Examiner, ii. 414, 415, 434-6.
——— Reformer, ii. 360, 367.
Christian Remembrancer, i. 438; ii. 393.
"Christian Sabbath," i. 230, 231; whether the Lord's-day was anciently so called, i. 349-51; the phrase not scriptural, i. 231, ii. 452. *See* Lord's-day.
Christmas, i. 245; ii. 370, 371, 404.
Chrysostom, i. 122, 123, 126, 138, 170, 365-6, 403; ii. 4, 5, 122, 179.
Chubb, Thomas, ii. 187, 462; answer to, 198.
Church, original meaning of the word, ii. 129; authority of the, i. 169, 186.
Church services, improvement of, ii. 372.
Church of England, Formularies of Faith of, i. 138, 412; Injunctions, ii. 347; Constitutions and Canons, i. 144, 171, 412; Fourth Commandment in Liturgy, i. 138, 146, 169, 215, 226, 240, 391, 395, 412, 413, 424, 440; ii. 102, 104, 122, 124, 173, 193, 244, 273, 347, 349, 379, 384; Homilies, i. 139, 178, 190, 197, 199, 240, 259, 263, 412, 440, 460, 461; ii. 9, 101, 104, 122, 124, 157; Catechism, i. 139, 412, 413, 425; ii. 104, 173, 336, 347, 349; Archbishop Sharp's exposition of her doctrine of the Lord's-day, ii. 141, 192, 213, 336; Bishop Porteus's exposition, 247; Dean Hook's, 369; Dr Hessey's, 390; use made of the Fathers and of tradition by, i. 311; ii. 369: why should not her services be made more attractive? 372.
Church of England Quarterly Review, ii. 205, 345, 357, 360; i. 320.
Church of Ireland, Articles of, i. 255, 259, 262.
Circumcision was lawful on the Sabbath, i. 71, 180, 220, 223, 405; ii. 224; whether practised by the patriarchs, i. 330; regarded as typical of the Lord's-day, i. 324, 353; assertion that it is not mentioned after the settlement in Canaan, ii. 363; of proselytes, 204; practised by a Christian sect in the 17th century, 58.
Clarendon, Lord, i. 228.

Clarke, Samuel, ii. 169, 211.
Cleadon, Thomas, ii. 46.
Cleaver, Robert, i. 160.
Clement of Alexandria, i. 121, 124, 337, 177, 221, 224, 275, 277, 282, 283, 284, 299, 310, 315, 345, 352, 475; ii. 4, 8, 43, 89, 158, 300, 335.
——— of Rome, i. 118, 119, 313, 319; ii. 4.
Clerc (Clericus), John Le. *See* Le Clerc.
Clergy, many opposed to Sabbatarianism, ii. 267; dogmatism unbecoming the, 376; advice to, 398.
Clifford, Arthur B., ii. 364, 410.
Cluto, John, ii. 139.
Coaches, ii. 323, 334, 343, 363, 406.
Cocceius, John, ii. 1, 6, 129, 139, 180.
Cochrane, Charles, ii. 343, 442.
Cockin, William, ii. 329.
Coleman, Lyman, ii. 416; quoted, i. 151, 304, 344, 363, 364; referred to, i. 118, 120, 121, 122, 125, 127, 129, 136, 139, 152, 163, 352, 461; ii. 438.
Colenso, J. W., i. 437.
Coleridge, S. T., ii. 131, 372, 400.
Collections for the poor, i. 93, 335; ii. 176, 209, 264, 293-5, 452-3.
Collier, Giles, i. 254.
——— Jeremy, i. 146, 430, 448.
——— J. Payne, i. 139, 264, 468.
Collings, John, i. 244, 246, 254, 443.
Combe, George, i. 387; ii. 407, 431.
Comedy acted on Sunday, i. 264. *See* Theatre.
Commandments. *See* Decalogue; Fourth Commandment.
Commemoration different from keeping holy, i. 365; a purpose of the Sabbath—*see* Sabbath.
"Companion for the Lord's Day," ii. 165.
Concerts, ii. 324, 407.
Conder, Josiah, ii. 336; referred to, i. 139; ii. 35, 334, 338, 410, 433.
Confession of sins to priests, i. 381.
Confessions of Faith:—Augsburg, i. 130, 172, 410; ii. 136, 141; Beza's, i. 134; Scottish, of 1560, i. 127, 389, 466; ii. 390; Swiss, i. 172; ii. 5; Westminster, i. 228, 235, 236, 269, 306, 351, 391, 395, 419; ii. 452, 462.
Confirmation, authority of, ii. 372, 391-2.
Connecticut, i. 235, 252, 253; ii. 307.
Conscience, i. 242, 243; how far it enforces Sabbath-observance, ii. 344; weakened by factitious or excessive impositions, ii. 391; erroneous, 12. *See* Law of Nature; Moral; Criminals.
Constantine, i. 121, 257, 355, 134, 171, 177, 223, 322, 360, 421, 440; ii. 12, 55, 130, 154, 296, 301, 335, 373, 394, 398, 417, 431.
Constitutions, Apostolical, i. 319, 348; of the Church of England, 144.
Continental Sunday, ii. 307, 308-312, 314, 343, 353, 355, 364, 365, 372, 379, 391, 403-4, 408.
Conventions, Sabbath, in the United States, ii. 414-17.
Convocation, holy, i. 19, 20, 23; ii. 79, 112, 229, 252, 382.
Cook, George, ii. 332, 161; i. 123, 124, 125, 428, 472.
Cooking on the Sabbath, i. 8, 18, 141, 149, 165, 176, 213, 215, 229, 243, 250, 418, 454; ii. 25, 85, 222.
Cooper, William, ii. 330.
Copernican system, ii. 25, 211.
Copleston, Edward, ii. 363, 379.
Coptic Church, i. 343.
Corinth, Paul's injunction to the Church of, as to laying-by alms, i. 93, 129, 134, 137, 138, 161, 166, 177, 223, 231, 233, 267, 337, 376, 407; ii. 3, 18, 31, 43, 53, 84, 118, 119, 120, 154, 158, 176, 209, 255, 264, 293-5, 331, 332, 369, 374, 382, 394, 452-3, 457.
Cornthwaite, Robert, ii. 185, 186, 187, 198, 464.
Corruption of the works of the Fathers, i. 307, 315, 318, 327-30, 348.
Cosin, John, i. 455; ii. 372, 388.
Cosmogony, Hebrew. *See* Creation.
Cotelerius, ii. 299, 305.
Cotton, John, i. 251, 253.
Court, Robert, ii. 394.
Courts of Law, sittings and vacations of, ii. 350.
Covenant, Jewish, i. 202; ii. 95, 129.

Covenanters, Scottish, i. 467, 474; ii. 77, 448.
Cowell, John, ii. 57, 259.
Cowper, William, quoted, i. 388.
Cox, Robert, ii. 360, 410; quoted, 96, 345; referred to, i. 113, 118, 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 129, 131, 136, 138, 139, 145, 152, 163, 164, 182, 189, 206, 231, 235, 241, 244, 249, 256, 266, 269, 387, 391, 393, 433, 437, 472; ii. 16, 22, 24, 35, 77, 78, 118, 152, 211, 306, 315, 323, 331, 332, 334, 340, 341, 343, 350, 355, 356, 365, 386, 411; Extracts from Calvin, &c., edited by, 386.
Cramp, J. M., ii. 348.
Cranbrook, James, ii. 358, 410.
Cranmer, Thomas, i. 135; ii. 347, 386.
Crawford (Crafordius), Matthew, ii. 18, 447.
Creation, Hebrew account of the, i. 1, 109 *n*, 231, 387-8 *n*; ii. 66, 327; whether historical, ii. 170, 211, 345; i. 437-9; mystical interpretations of, 290, 315-16, 340; ii. 170, 211, 457; was the Sabbath instituted at the creation?—*see* Sabbath.
Criminals, whether and how demoralised by Sabbath-breaking, i. 414; ii. 304, 306, 378, 381, 391.
Crispin, St, holiday of, ii. 217.
Croly, George, i. 439.
Cromwell, Oliver, i. 266.
Crusius, Martin, i. 144.
Crystal Palace at Sydenham, ii. 239, 313, 343, 359, 360, 363, 376, 377, 396-407.
Cuchlinus, John, ii. 139.
Cunningham, John W., ii. 337.
Cureton, William, i. 120, 318, 319.
Cyprian, i. 121, 124, 177, 299, 353, 354; ii. 4, 335.
Cyril, i. 122; ii. 4.

Dabney, Dr, i. 362; ii. 416.
Daillé, John, quoted, i. 307-10, 312.
Dairies, ii. 337.
Damascenus, i. 124, 167, 201.
Dancing, i. 176, 178, 188, 343, 446, 467, 469; ii. 30, 217, 221, 307.
Danes, ii. 365.
Darling's *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i. 437; ii. 409.
David, king of Israel, i. 49, 176, 180.
Davidson, Dr Samuel, i. 432, 435.
——— Samuel, ii. 418.
Davies, John, ii. 310.
Davis, Joseph, ii. 80.
——— Mrs Tamar, ii. 419; i. 344.
——— Sir John Francis, i. 114.
Dawson, George, ii. 376, 400.
——— J. W., i. 438.
Day, meaning of the word in Gen. i. and the Fourth Commandment, i. 158; ii. 327, 345; divisions of the, ii. 40; Jewish, began at sunset, i. 1, 21, 36, 57 *n*, 86 *n*, 252, 478, 479; ii. 40, 58, 181, 200, 220, 253, 293, 294, 385; this disputed by Dr Wallis, ii. 91; holiness of days, what—*see* Holy; Paul's doctrine as to the observance of days, i. 90, 97, 101, 135, 137, 143, 165, 177, 202, 210, 223, 332, 343, 346, 370, 376, 404, 410, 424, 440; ii. 12, 16, 22, 24, 29, 31, 50, 51, 54, 67, 71, 100, 104, 109, 147, 177, 188, 190, 192-3, 199, 200, 209, 226, 230, 254, 296, 327, 343, 350, 374-5, 376, 380, 384, 439, 450-3, 457; names of the days of the week, i. 225, 324-5; ii. 42.
Decade, Greek, i. 287, 297; ii. 373; French, 322.
Decalogue, i. 11, 16, 25, 51, 90, 99, 105, 232-3; ii. 2—*see* Fourth Commandment; two editions of, i. 155, 309, 432; ii. 8, 145, 157, 213, 345, 373, 464; whether binding on Gentiles, i. 185, 195, 201, 226, 251, 372, 383-396; ii. 63, 93-98, 128, 143, 164, 174, 209, 212; regarded as an epitome of the whole Law, i. 371-2, 423; ii. 52; distinction drawn by some between it and rest of the Law, i. 326, 423, 393; ii. 98, 142, 145-6, 254-5, 379-80; its didactic use to Christians, i. 371, 374, 384; ii. 67; freedom from it does not imply freedom from the law of nature and of Christ, ii. 62; remarks of Irenæus on it, i. 326; its employment in the Service of the Church of England—*see* Liturgy.
Declaration of Sports. *See* Sports, Book of.
De Coetlogon, Charles, ii. 233.

De Courcy, Richard, ii. 234.
Dedication of the Temple, Feast of, i. 143; ii. 84.
Democratic Review, ii. 417.
Denmark, ii. 140.
Deuteronomy preferred by Jesus to the rest of the Pentateuch, i. 432-4.
Devotion, coldness in, ii. 147, 344; difference in power of experiencing, 321, 344.
De Wette, Wilhelm, i. 8; ii. 260.
Dewey, Orville, ii. 414, 434.
De Witte, Peter, ii. 139.
Dickinson, R. W., i. 437.
Dies Sabbati, i. 349, 351, 430, 459.
Dies Solis. *See* Sunday.
Dion Cassius, i. 221, 324, 325.
Dionysius of Corinth, i. 106, 120, 177, 298, 325; ii. 4, 300.
Disease often blunts religious feeling, ii. 150.
Disney, Dr, ii. 321.
D'Israeli, Isaac, ii. 332, 443; quoted, i. 127, 148; referred to, 152, 187, 430, 466.
Dissenters, English, i. 413. *See* Puritans.
Dobel, Daniel, ii. 464, 198.
Dod, John, i. 160.
Doddridge, Philip, ii. 208; quoted, i. 92, 100, 297; referred to, 318, 394; ii. 205.
Döllinger, J. J. I., i. 397.
Dominical opinion regarding Sunday, ii. 389; advocates of—*see* Lord's-day.
Dominicum, meaning of, i. 303, 354; alleged question put to Christian martyrs, "Dominicum servasti?" i. 154, 297.
Domville, Sir William, ii. 357, 363, 364, 410; quoted, i. 297, 304, 314, 316, 321, 323, 327, 335, 359; ii. 31, 45, 179, 180, 184, 261, 299, 330; referred to, i. 113, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 138, 139, 154, 257, 311, 323, 354, 360, 363, 397; ii. 4, 78, 182, 268, 300, 306, 332, 336, 343, 386, 392, 393, 411, 416.
Donaldson, J. W., i. 433-5.
Dort, Synod of, i. 218, 442; ii. 3, 5, 306.
Dow, Christopher, i. 183, 240; ii. 13.
Downaine, John, i. 260.
Drummond, Peter, ii. 347.
Drunkenness, i. 367, 445, 471 *n*; ii. 303, 308, 309, 315, 334, 343, 365, 379, 397, 399, 403, 442.
Dublin Botanic Garden, ii. 407.
Du Halde, referred to, i. 114.
Duns, John, ii. 438.
Durham, James, i. 236.
Dutch controversies about the Sabbath. *See* Holland.
Duthie, William, ii. 312, 378-9.
Duties. *See* Moral; Positive.
Duvergier, ii. 322.
Dwight, Timothy, ii. 411; i. 120, 311, 327, 328-9; ii. 99, 259, 268, 348, 414, 443.
Dyce, William, i. 410, 411; ii. 384.
Dymond, Jonathan, ii. 33.

EADIE, John, i. 323, 324, 325; ii. 351.
Earing-time, i. 17, 405, 407; ii. 223.
Earle, John, i. 458.
Eastbourne, Sunday band at, ii. 364.
Easter, i. 326, 360, 459; ii. 370, 371, 404.
Eaton, Nathaniel, i. 164; ii. 29.
Ebionites, i. 319; ii. 63.
Ebrington, Lord, ii. 364.
Ecclesiastical origin of the observance of the Lord's-day, theory of, ii. 388, 392. *See* Lord's-day.
E. C. H. quoted, i. 354.
Eclectic Review, i. 129; ii. 35, 336, 338, 433.
Edgar the Peaceable, a Sunday law of, i. 458.
Edinburgh, i. 435, 467-474; ii. 162, 353, 360.
Edinburgh Review, i. 289-292, 348, 435, 439; ii. 97, 323, 325.
Edinensis, pamphlet by, ii. 352.
Edmonds, T., ii. 409.
Edward VI., statutes of, i. 144, 171, 178; ii. 425; Injunctions of, 347.
Edwards, John, ii. 156.
——— Jonathan, ii. 176, 411; quoted, i. 197, 206.
——— Justin, ii. 416, 430.
Egypt, the Sabbath in relation to Israel's deliverance from, i. 25, 154, 378; ii. 11, 49, 52, 103, 135, 143, 170.
Eliberis, Council of, ii. 56, 153.
Eliot, John, ii. 27.

Elisha's time, i. 31, 176.
Elizabeth, Queen, i. 171, 234, 468; ii. 336, 371, 425.
—— Charlotte, ii. 340.
Elrington, Dr, i. 256, 260, 262, 263.
Encyclopædia Britannica, ii. 394; i. 279, 389.
England, Sunday in, i. 413; ii. 210, 247, 368; Church of—*see* Church of England.
Ephrem Syrus quoted, ii. 26.
Epiphanius, i. 122; ii. 4.
Erasmus quoted, ii. 201.
Erastius, Henry, ii. 139.
"Essays and Reviews," i. 437, 438.
Essenes, i. 116, 216.
Essenius, Andrew, ii. 5, 10, 448.
Estlin, J. P., ii. 329.
"Ethics of the Sabbath," ii. 343. *See* Conscience; Law of Nature.
Ethiopians. *See* Abyssinians.
Etrurians, i. 114, 287.
Eucharist. *See* Lord's Supper.
Eusebius, i. 122, 359; quoted, 357; referred to, 167, 201, 223, 259, 275, 299, 325, 326, 356, 365, 403; ii. 4, 43, 260.
Evangelical Magazine, ii. 410.
—— party, i. 146; ii. 323, 329, 364, 384, 443.
Evanson, Edward, ii. 291; referred to, i. 318; ii. 261; reply to, 315.
Example of God, Jesus, and the Apostles, whether and how far a rule of conduct to mankind, i. 171, 402, 475, 476; ii. 35, 39, 51-54, 83, 126, 142, 157, 318, 386.
Exercise, bodily, on Sunday, i. 241-2. *See* Walking.
Expediency, what, ii. 352; of sabbatical institutions, 248, 355. *See* Sabbath; Lord's-day.
Exton, Francis, ii. 346.

FABER, Geo. S., i. 281.
Fahnestock, W. M., ii. 418-19.
Fairbairn, Patrick, ii. 346, 410; i. 382, 387, 389, 394, 397, 405, 420, 425, 457, 461; ii. 2.
Fairs on Saturday and Monday, ii. 339.
Falconer, Thomas, ii. 291.
Familists, i. 205, 250.
Farre, Dr, ii. 337.
Fasting on the Lord's-day heretical, i. 178, 334; ii. 55, 56, 155; of the early Christians, i. 333, 334, 339; Acts of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth as to, ii. 425.
Fasts, ii. 350; the Jewish annual, i. 20, 199, 397; ii. 460.
Fathers of the Church, i. 118-125, 306, 166, 167, 170, 177, 190, 195, 196, 197, 198, 201, 245, 256; ii. 1, 3, 5, 12, 31, 55, 74, 82, 129, 145, 153, 160, 189, 297, 357, 359, 383, 386, 389, 393; summary of their opinions about the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, i. 124; reasons assigned by them for the observance of Sunday, i. 125, 223, 320, 336, 347, 353, 363-4, 456, 475; ii. 4, 145, 333, 383, 393.
Fearon, Henry, ii. 347, 334, 411.
Feasting on the Sabbath, i. 46, 64, 171, 176, 204, 206, 216, 227, 229, 241, 243, 251, 294, 367, 368, 399, 417; ii. 19, 79, 112, 164, 195, 219, 227, 304, 305, 399; on the Lord's-day, i. 141, 145, 149, 207, 216, 262, 333; ii. 33, 127, 130.
Fecht of Rostock, ii. 134.
Felt, Joseph B., i. 253.
Fenner, William, ii. 140; i. 427.
Festivals, natural origin and expediency of, i. 142, 148, 286, 418, 422; ii. 65, 248-50; Jewish, i. 379; ii. 439; Christian—*see* Holy-days; Neale's work on feasts and fasts, ii. 350.
Fiddes, Richard, ii. 165.
Fidus, ii. 332.
Field, John, i. 140.
Fighting in war, whether lawful on the Sabbath, i. 176; ii. 222, 253.
Fires on the Sabbath, prohibition to kindle, i. 18, 213, 215, 251, 418; ii. 25, 85, 222.
Fisher, Edward, i. 237, 265; ii. 418; answer to, i. 244, 254.
—— William Logan, ii. 417.
Fishing on Sunday, i. 188, 465; ii. 106, 437.
Fleming, Caleb, ii. 186; answer to, 186-7.
Flockenius, ii. 331.
Forbes, John, ii. 336.
—— Sir John, ii. 315.

Forgeries, literary, i. 307-9.
Formularies of Faith. *See* Catechisms; Confessions; Church of England.
Foster, James, ii. 202.
——— Stephen S., ii. 430.
——— William, ii. 338.
Fourth Commandment, i. 11, 17, 25; two editions of, assigning different reasons, 11, 25, 154-6, 399, 418, 432; ii. 8, 103, 110, 145, 157, 173, 194, 213, 254, 344-5, 373, 393, 415. Meaning of "remember" in, i. 232, 374, 376; ii. 133; of "day," i. 158; ii. 327, 345; of "work," i. 416; ii. 2 *n*, 221, 443-6. Whether and how far binding on Gentiles, i. 132, 135, 137, 141, 143, 145, 148, 156, 159, 162, 167, 168, 175, 178, 185, 189, 190, 195, 201, 204-13, 220, 226, 239, 244, 251, 373, 383-396, 415, 419; ii. 18, 36, 63, 85, 92-98, 128, 143-4, 147, 164, 174, 192, 199, 204, 209, 212, 230, 254, 256-7, 268, 349, 364, 456. What it *teaches* them, i. 371, 374, 384-94, 477; ii. 67. In what sense used in the Service of the Church of England—*see* Liturgy. Recognised by that Church, both before and after the Reformation, as in some sense obligatory, ii. 347. Various translations of, i. 137; ii. 204, 212, 462. Roman Catholic adaptations of, i. 152, 424, 455-6. Does it bind servants? 159, 161. Does it enjoin any Sabbath duty but resting? i. 116, 168, 240, 377, 396-402; ii. 2, 68, 78, 107-11, 112, 113, 146, 164, 188, 194, 204, 215, 218, 229, 244, 269, 348, 358, 382, 449, 456, 458, 460-2. Does it appoint not merely one day in seven, but specially the seventh day of the week, to be kept holy? i. 140, 204, 227, 239, 247; ii. 35, 39, 44, 45, 51, 81, 85, 87, 101, 104, 126, 127, 128, 133, 142, 160, 168, 194, 243, 349. Does it command six days' work, as well as rest on the seventh? i. 204, 379, 411; ii. 75, 84, 126. Does it forbid recreation? i. 171, 231, 233, 240; ii. 304—*see* Recreation. Never adduced by the Fathers as a ground for Sunday-observance, i. 125, 223, 320, 347, 353, 363-4; ii. 4, 145, 333, 383, 393, 456, 475; applied by them, the Romish Church, and the Reformers, to a spiritual Sabbath, i. 124, 132, 135, 137, 170, 197, 325, 327, 339, 349-51, 365-9, 370, 378, 401; ii. 52, 170, 259, 300. Use made of it in the middle ages, i. 459. Whether and how far a moral law, i. 109, 140, 207, 221, 231, 239, 240, 242, 257, 264, 266, 269, 366, 370, 375, 419, 422, 423, 442, 462; ii. 11, 64, 75, 83, 119, 135, 140, 190, 202, 246, 253, 255, 269, 325, 344, 381, 384, 393, 450, 456. *See* Sabbath.
France, i. 354, 424; ii. 155, 268, 307, 321, 343, 367, 400, 403, 422, 441-2.
Franke, C. C. L., i. 297; ii. 438.
Fraser's Magazine, ii. 357.
Frauds, pious, ii. 391.
Friday, i. 333, 334, 339, 340, 345, 357.
Frisius, Sam., i. 288.
Frith, John, i. 136, 178; ii. 322.
Fuller, Thomas, i. 247; quoted, 147, 153, 162, 213, 214; referred to, 146, 152, 163, 164, 430, 452.
Fulton, Henry, ii. 372, 334, 410.
Furness, W. H., ii. 417.

Gairdner, John, i. 472-4.
Galatinus, i. 214.
Gaming, ii. 247, 258, 335.
Gangra, Council of, ii. 153.
Ganse, Harvey D., ii. 417, 436.
Garden, Francis, ii. 442.
Gardener, Charles, ii. 330.
Gardens, public, ii. 310, 313, 337.
Garrison, W. L., ii. 424.
Gaume, Abbé, ii. 442.
Gaussen, L., i. 438.
Geddes, Dr, quoted, i. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20; referred to, ii. 211.
Gellius, Aulus, i. 291.
Geneva, ii. 443; Catechism, i. 128, 466.
Gennadius, ii. 4.
Gentiles, whether anciently subject to the Law of Moses, i. 11,

24, 39, 79, 81-3, 87, 89, 92, 96, 100, 143, 185, 202, 220, 244, 245, 477; ii. 30, 36, 92, 93, 96, 144, 193, 199, 207, 259, 260, 268; whether bound by the Fourth Commandment — *see* Fourth Commandment; whether they observed the Sabbath, i. 108, 113, 116, 117, 148, 175, 221, 224, 225, 244, 258, 273, 284, 419, 475; ii. 8, 42, 45, 90, 126; Gentile Christians in relation to the Sabbath, ii. 358, 382, 385-6, 390; origin of heathen festivals, i. 142, 148, 286, 418, 422; ii. 65.
Geology in reference to the Hebrew cosmogony, i. 231, 290-2, 437; ii. 345, 464.
Germany, i. 126, 129, 133-5, 397; ii. 134, 214, 217, 309, 438.
Gesenius, i. 397.
Gesner, i. 297.
Gibson, Bishop, i. 428: ii. 197.
Gieseler, i. 315, 317, 358.
Giles, J. A., i. 124.
Gilfillan, James, ii. 395; quoted and criticised, i. 286, 289, 311, 316, 323, 327, 337, 342-3, 386, 426-7, 464; ii. 448; referred to, i. 315, 318, 352, 362, 388, 389, 398, 408, 409, 412, 419, 439, 442, 444, 462, 465, 475, 479; ii. 447, 448.
——— Samuel, ii. 330.
Gill, John, ii. 213.
Gillespie, George, i. 229.
Gillett, W. B., ii. 419.
Glasgow, i. 254, 435; ii. 343, 351, 353, 360, 394.
Glasnevin Botanic Garden, ii. 407.
Glasse, Samuel, ii. 245.
Glass-works, i. 229.
Glen, John, ii. 330.
Gloag, Paton J., i. 438.
Glover, William, ii. 342.
Gnostics, i. 338, 342.
God. *See* Example; Law; Judgments; Worship.
Gomarus, Francis, i. 159, 163, 218, 442; referred to, i. 258, 277; ii. 54; answers to, i. 162, 194, 218, 240; ii. 40.
Goodman, Bishop, ii. 308.
Goodwin, C. W., i. 437, 438.
——— Philip, i. 246.
Gordon, John, ii. 363.
Gouge, William, i. 193.
Gowring, G. J., ii. 345.
Grahame, James, ii. 329.
Grainger, R. D., ii. 343.
Grandpierre, J. H., ii. 342, 442.
Grant, Sir Francis, ii. 458.
Grantham, Thomas, ii. 447.
Grapel, William, ii. 409; i. 236.
Grascome, Samuel, ii. 114, 116.
Grave-diggers, ii. 403.
Graves, Richard, i. 391.
Gray, Mrs Hamilton, i. 114.
——— James, ii. 330.
Greeks, i. 114, 283, 285, 287, 292, 293.
Greenham, Richard, i. 140; ii. 308.
Gregory of Nazianzus, i. 216; ii. 4, 56.
Gregory of Nyssa, i. 122; ii. 4, 129.
——— of Tours, ii. 432.
——— the Great, ii. 4.
——— John, ii. 73.
Greville, R. K., ii. 342.
Grew, Henry, ii. 417.
Griesbach, J. J., ii. 182.
Griffith, John, ii. 407.
Groningen, controversy in, ii. 6.
Grosvenor, Lord Robert, Letter to, ii. 363.
Grotius, Hugo, i. 217, 476; referred to, 113, 269, 281, 288, 315, 320, 332, 394, 403; ii. 30, 82, 113, 146, 180, 204, 294.
Gruter referred to, i. 359.
Guild, William, i. 188, 465.
Gumpach, J. von, ii. 356.
Gunnison, N., ii. 437.
Gurney, Joseph John, ii. 336; i. 154, 297, 316, 327, 360.
Guthrie, Thomas, ii. 379.
Gutzlaff referred to, i. 114.

Hackwill, Dr, i. 266.
Hague, William, ii. 417.
Hakewill, George, i. 217.
Haldane, Robert, i. 396; ii. 340.
Hale, Chief-Justice, ii. 168, 169, 431, 432.
Hales, Dr, i. 281.
Hall, Archibald, ii. 229.
——— Bishop, i. 196, 197.
——— Peter, i. 255.
——— Willard, ii. 416.
Hallam, Henry, i. 428, 447, 451, 452; ii. 425.
Hallet, Joseph, ii. 174, 198, 212; referred to, i. 394, 432; ii. 456.
Hallowed. *See* Holy.
Hamilton, James, ii. 342.

Hamilton, Richard Winter, ii. 184, 341, 342, 410, 433.
——— Robert, ii. 393.
Hammond, Henry, i. 269.
Hampton Court, ii. 397.
Hannah, John, ii. 342.
Harcourt, Lord Chancellor, ii. 244.
——— W. Vernon, i. 437.
Hare, Julius Charles, i. 285, 325, 359; ii. 315.
Harris, Major, i. 343, 346.
Harvest-work on the Sabbath and Sunday, i. 17, 133, 141, 149, 171, 358-9, 405, 407, 421; ii. 223.
Hävernick, i. 397.
Health, preservation of, i. 416.
Heathen. *See* Gentiles.
Hebdomas of the Gnostics, i. 342, 352.
Heber, Bishop, quoted, i. 150.
Heberstreit, ii. 200.
Hebrews, Epistle to the, by whom written? ii. 23.
Heidanus, Abraham, ii. 5, 10, 139.
Helmoldus quoted, i. 258.
Helps, Arthur, quoted, ii. 313, 357.
Helvetic Confession, i. 172; ii. 5.
Hely, Mr, i. 200.
Henderson, Alexander, 229.
——— Ebenezer, ii. 461.
——— Henry, ii. 346.
Hendersonian Prize Essays, ii. 341.
Hengstenberg, E. W., ii. 438, 439; quoted, i. 217, 359, 370, 393; ii. 6, 78, 98, 118, 134; referred to, i. 113, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 216, 288, 384, 389; ii. 119, 386.
Henry VIII., Formularies in reign of, i. 138.
Hesiod, i. 224, 275-7, 280, 292; ii. 8, 42, 89, 103.
Hessey, James A., ii. 386, 442; quoted, i. 287, 315; 318, 324, 325, 330, 343, 352, 355, 359-60, 395, 422, 423; ii. 411, 414, 438, 455; referred to, i. 289, 290, 297, 311, 344, 354, 355, 365, 409, 412, 424, 431, 433, 440, 442, 443, 444, 455, 458, 460, 461, 463, 475, 476; ii. 325, 331, 340, 350, 355, 365, 372, 375, 378, 383.
Hesychius, i. 274.
Hetherington, W. M., ii. 342; quoted, i. 235; referred to, 127, 228, 231, 150, 362.
Heurtley, Charles A., ii. 346, 410.
Hey, William, ii. 464.
Heylin, Peter, i. 173, 458, 164, 262, 264; ii. 18; editions of his History of the Sabbath, i. 345 *n*, 355, 461; his character, 179, 447 *n*, 452, 460; quoted, 145, 153, 158, 256, 321, 337-40, 343, 345, 347, 355, 430, 447, 454, 475; ii. 432; referred to, i. 116, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 127, 131, 136, 138, 139, 146, 163, 183, 184, 186, 189, 196, 215, 247, 258, 259, 270, 355, 363, 413, 452, 453, 456, 458-9, 460; ii. 29, 35, 57, 154, 193, 260, 292; answers to, i. 179, 200, 209, 228, 240, 259, 263, 265; ii. 40, 172, 335.
Heywood, James, i. 113; ii. 364.
Hickson, W. E., ii. 359; referred to, i. 114.
Higgins, Godfrey, ii. 332, 100, 352, 414; i. 121, 356 *n*.
Higginson, Edward, ii. 360, 367, 398, 410.
Hilary, i. 122, 197; ii. 4, 335.
Hill, Micaiah, ii. 346, 372, 410; i. 362.
——— Robert, ii. 172; quoted, i. 179; ii. 194; referred to, i. 182, 364.
Hindoos, i. 114, 287; ii. 356.
Hinds, Bishop, i. 317, 318; ii. 385.
Hippolytus, i. 334.
Hircher quoted, ii. 440.
Hitchcock, Edward, i. 437.
Hodge, Charles, ii. 417.
Hody, Dr, i. 282.
Holden, George, ii. 330; quoted, i. 314, 327, 336, 349-50; referred to, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 241, 297, 318, 332, 336, 344, 354, 360, 363, 398; ii. 118, 129, 259, 300, 315, 458.
Holidays, need of, i. 235-6; ii. 404. *See* Recreation; Holy-days.
Holland, disputes there about the Sabbath, i. 157, 159, 162, 163, 217-18, 441; ii. 1-6, 10, 27, 134, 137, 365, 447, 448, 459.
Holy—hallowed—sanctified, meaning of, in the Law of Moses, as to things in general, i. 3 *n*, 137, 396; ii. 78, 373, 382, 449, 460-2; in respect to the Sabbath, i. 110, 176, 320, 377, 396-9, 420, 457; ii.

75, 78, 110, 112-13, 126, 146, 164, 188, 194, 207, 229, 244, 305, 312, 373, 382, 456, 458, 460-2; sense in which days are now called holy, i. 137, 150, 205, 233, 377, 396, 409; ii. 75, 146, 312. *See* Days; Sabbath.
Holy convocation, i. 19, 20, 23; ii. 79, 112, 229, 252, 382.
Holy-days of the Church, other than the Lord's-day, i. 132, 144, 145, 146, 205, 210, 245, 270, 346, 358, 379, 410, 414, 423, 429, 455-6; ii. 8, 18, 34, 35, 84, 185, 347, 350, 370, 371, 404, 384, 425, 451. *See* Festivals.
Homer, i. 224, 275, 279, 280, 282, 292, 258; ii. 8, 42, 103.
Homes, Nathanael, ii. 39, 86, 101; referred to, i. 285, 442, 462.
Homilies of Church of England, i. 139, 178, 190, 197, 199, 240, 259, 263, 412, 440, 460, 461; ii. 9, 101, 104, 122, 124; Bishop Burnet's Essay towards a new Book of, ii. 157.
Hook, Walter F., ii. 368, 410; quoted, i. 311, 394; referred to, 127, 139, 184, 311, 476; ii. 396; Letter to, ii. 372.
Hooker, Horace, ii. 415.
—— Richard, i. 141, 332, 355, 419, 421; ii. 388.
Hooper, John, i. 136, 178; ii. 204.
Hoornbeek, John, ii. 6, 138.
Hopkins, Ezekiel, ii. 82, 157; i. 392.
Horeb, Mount, i. 10, 24, 26, 31.
Horses need a weekly day of rest, ii. 169, 225. *See* Cattle.
Horsley, Bishop, ii. 325; quoted, 45, 312, 428, 429; referred to, i. 241, 313, 439, 451; ii. 16, 272, 372, 388, 394.
Hoskins, Dr, i. 213.
Hospinian, Ralph, i. 154, 172, 431; ii. 202.
Howell, John, ii. 127; i. 351, 395.
Hug, John L., i. 315.
Hughes, George, ii. 22, 329, 459.
—— Joseph, ii. 329.
—— T. S., ii. 332; quoted, i. 279; ii. 294; referred to, i. 74. 113, 121, 221, 476.
Humboldt, Alex. von, i. 113, 114, 289.
Hume, David, referred to, i. 235.
Humphrey, Heman, ii. 414.
Humphrey, W. H., ii. 437.
Hutchinson, Thomas, referred to, i. 251, 253.
Huxtable, Edgar, i. 438, 439.
Hypocrites, i. 48, 51, 53, 242; ii. 32, 33.

IDLENESS on the Lord's-day, i. 133, 142, 234; ii. 188, 246, 303.
Idolatry, Mosaic legislation against, ii. 78, 219.
Ierson, Henry, ii. 364, 401, 410.
Ignatius, i. 119, 118, 318, 123, 177, 259, 298, 329, 334, 348 *n*; ii. 3, 39, 55, 141, 154, 160, 189, 210, 299, 305, 335, 357.
Ignorance, how far an excuse for disobedience, ii. 37.
Ikenius, Conrad, ii. 176.
Illiberis, Council of, ii. 56, 153.
Imitation of God, &c. *See* Example.
India, i. 114, 287; ii. 356.
Infidel, Scriptural meaning of, ii. 291.
Innes, William, ii. 342.
Innocent, Pope, ii. 56.
Inspiration, plenary, i. 436.
Interludes, i. 446, 451, 468; ii. 455.
Intolerance, religious, i. 133, 150, 153, 234, 251; ii. 60, 86, 97.
Irenæus, i. 120, 325; quoted, i. 180; ii. 257; referred to, i. 167, 201, 299; ii. 4, 64, 259, 268, 298, 335.
Irenæus Philalethes, i. 226.
Irish Articles of Religion, i. 255, 259, 260, 262.
Ironside, Gilbert, i. 189; referred to, 188, 288; ii. 29, 432; answers to, i. 194, 240.
Ironworks, i. 229; ii. 337, 361, 435.
Irving, David, quoted, i. 304.
Irwin, Alex., ii. 346, 410; ii. 263, 306.
Isidorus, ii. 4.
Italian name of Saturday, i. 554.
Ives, Jeremy, ii. 6.

JACOBSON, William, i. 120.
Jahn, John, referred to, ii. 167.
James I., king of England, i. 152, 425, 444, 145, 178, 183, 197, 255, 256, 263, 468, 473, 480; ii. 124, 246, 307, 332, 336, 442.
—— John Angell, ii. 342.
—— William, ii. 335, 336; quoted, i. 318, 337, 344, 346-8;

referred to, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 136, 139, 179, 182, 257, 319, 321, 327, 355, 363, 413, 461; ii. 268.
Japanese, i. 114.
Jay, William, ii. 323.
Jenkins, Charles, ii. 414.
Jennings, David, ii. 210; i. 281.
Jennison, William, ii. 447.
Jephson, Alex., ii. 191; i. 395; answer to, ii. 198.
Jericho, siege of, i. 29, 176, 180, 220; ii. 11, 21.
Jerome, i. 123, 135, 201, 308; ii. 4, 12.
Jerusalem, sieges of, i. 286; ii. 253.
Jesus, his doctrine and practice in regard to the Law of Moses, i. 47, 48, 51, 52, 62, 63, 65, 71, 108, 144, 243, 379; in regard to the Sabbath, i. 48, 49, 50, 51, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 126, 167, 180, 204, 216, 221, 222, 229, 241, 243, 367, 432; ii. 19, 23, 33, 50, 53, 95, 113, 128, 143, 144, 164, 169-71, 174, 178, 181, 189, 193, 195, 230, 245, 256, 268, 304, 373, 390, 402; in regard to public worship, ii. 270, 282, 287, 317, 318, 320; did he transfer the Sabbath to Sunday? i. 361-4; his preference of Deuteronomy, i. 433; said to have distinguished between the traditional and the divine in the Hebrew Scriptures, ii. 373; his resurrection, in relation to the Sabbath and the Lord's-day—*see* Resurrection.
——— Followers of, ii. 393.
Jewish Chronicle, the, ii. 443.
Jews, did not handle money on the Sabbath, i. 223; ii. 180; how they honoured the Sabbath, 19; how they spent it in the time of the Fathers, i. 367, 368, 398; whether they were more strictly bound to rest on it than we are to rest on Sunday? 405, 418; said to have punished "proselytes of the gate" for keeping the Sabbath, ii. 205; their synagogue-worship, ii. 319—*see* Synagogue; modern, ii. 132, 433, 443; whether still under the Law, i. 385 *n*; ii. 358. *See* Law of Moses; Rabbies; Sabbath.
Job, Book of, i. 37 *n*.
Jobst, a friend of Luther, i. 388.
Johnson, Colonel R. M., ii. 412, 415, 418.
Johnston, John Brown, ii. 434.
——— Nathanael, ii. 6.
Johnstone, William Henry, ii. 358, 363, 410; quoted, 357; referred to, i. 386.
Jonas, Justus, i. 135.
Jonathan, Rabbi, ii. 133.
Jones, Sir William, ii. 211.
——— William, of Nayland, i. 241.
Jordan, John, ii. 340, 341, 342, 410; referred to, i. 113, 426; ii. 169, 259.
Jortin, John, ii. 229; referred to, i. 116, 139, 292, 394.
Josephus, i. 115; quoted, 216, 277, 292-3, 344, 346-8; ii. 69; referred to, i. 106, 113, 117, 221, 224, 225, 258, 279, 283, 284, 292, 398, 475; ii. 6, 19, 42, 112, 113, 158, 164, 166, 178, 319, 320, 373.
Joshua's command to the sun to stand still, i. 176.
Journal of Sacred Literature, ii. 342, 346, 356; referred to, i. 62, 124; ii. 343, 359, 363, 378.
Judaism, whether abolished, i. 385 *n*; ii. 358; modern Judaizers, 58. *See* Jews; Law of Moses; Puritans; Seventh-day Baptists.
Judgments, alleged divine, on Sabbath-breakers, i. 140, 149, 187, 191, 206, 262, 266, 465; ii. 16, 106, 118, 161, 202, 337, 415, 416, 427, 430-2.
Junius, Francis, ii. 139.
Jurieu, Peter, ii. 125.
Justi, Von, ii. 217.
Justin Martyr, i. 118, 120, 320; ii. 333; quoted, ii. 4 *n*, 64, 66, 297; referred to, i. 125, 167, 177, 201, 214, 220, 221, 223, 298, 299, 300, 353, 363, 416, 476; ii. 4, 55, 154, 259, 300, 335, 357.
Juvenal, i. 116.
Juvencus, ii. 4.
J. W., ii. 359.

KALISCH, M., ii. 443; i. 216.
Kay, Joseph, quoted, ii. 308.
Kaye, John, ii. 333; quoted, i. 284, 320, 341, 464; referred to, 120, 281, 287, 344, 345, 352; ii. 414.

Keach, Benjamin, ii. 115.
Kennedy, John, ii. 208.
Kennicott, Benjamin, ii. 202, 242; referred to, i. 37, 463; ii. 45.
Kenrick, John, i. 437.
Kentucky, ii. 433.
Kew Gardens, ii. 397, 407.
Killingworth, Grantham, ii. 191; answer to, 198.
King, David, ii. 342.
—— Peter, ii. 156, 189.
Kings, alleged divine right of, i. 388.
Kingsbury, Harmon, ii. 415, 422.
Kirkton, James, ii. 77.
Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature, ii. 350; i. 29, 38, 70, 110, 119, 120, 121, 125, 315, 437; ii. 167, 266.
—— Journal of Sacred Literature, ii. 342, 356; quoted, i. 345, 397; referred to, i. 62, 437; ii. 343, 359, 378, 443.
Knox, John, i. 127, 389, 466-8; ii. 97, 319, 355, 386, 390.
—— Vicesimus, ii. 239; referred to, i. 241; ii. 158, 286, 315, 325.
Koelman, James, ii. 137, 448, 449, 459.
Kurtz, John Henry, i. 438.

LABOUR, meaning of, in the Fourth Commandment, i. 416; ii. 221, 443-6; whether enjoined on six days, i. 204, 379, 411; ii. 75, 84, 126. *See* Rest.
Labourers, refreshment of, i. 25; ii. 25, 249, 367. *See* Recreation.
Lactantius, i. 356; ii. 4.
Laing, Samuel, ii. 365.
Lake, Bishop, i. 197, 214, 364, 420; ii. 76.
Lamb, James J., ii. 394.
Lambeth Articles, i. 255, 262.
Lampridius, i. 224, 277; ii. 8.
Lanarkshire, i. 254.
Langley, J. Baxter, ii. 379, 394.
Laodicea, Council of, i. 343, 348; ii. 12, 56, 335.
La Placette, John, ii. 126.
Lardner, Nathaniel, i. 120, 297, 322, 329; ii. 205.
Larkin, Charles, ii. 349.
Latimer, Bishop, i. 197.
Laud, Archbishop, i. 164, 166, 189, 197, 207, 227, 447, 451-2, 465, 474; ii. 18, 131.
Law of Nature, i. 211, 231, 239, 366, 372, 374, 440; ii. 7, 30, 62, 82, 144, 407, 431, 435, 456. *See* Moral.
—— Positive, i. 366; ii. 11, 82, 255, 326, 379. *See* Fourth Commandment; Moral.
—— of Moses, i. 6-29; whether given only to the Israelites, i. 11, 24, 39, 79, 81-3, 87, 89, 92, 96, 100, 143, 185, 202, 220, 244, 245, 477; ii. 30, 36, 92, 93, 96, 144, 193, 199, 207, 259, 260, 263, 380; appointed by Moses to be read to them every seventh year, i. 28, 168; ii. 108, 219; whether appointed by him to be read in assemblies on the Sabbath-day, i. 110, 116, 168, 176, 294-5, 399; ii. 68, 79, 107, 112-13, 166, 195, 215, 219, 227-8, 229, 252-3, 305, 364, 373; no distinction in it between moral and ceremonial, ii. 255, 379; doctrine and practice of Jesus in regard to it—*see* Jesus; continued to be observed by Paul, i. 88, 89, 92, 108, 343; ii. 62, 63, 144, 382; in relation to the Gospel, i. 89-104, 365, 366, 383-96, 410, 457, 477; ii. 451; Michaelis on the, 214; its didactic use to the Gentiles, i. 371, 374, 384-396, 424, 477; ii. 30, 67*n*, 97, 144.
Laws about Sunday:—(1.) Roman, i. 121, 134, 171, 177, 223, 257, 322, 355-9, 421; ii. 12, 56, 154, 296, 301, 394, 398; (2.) Ecclesiastical, in middle ages, ii. 56, 154; (3.) Anglo-Saxon, i. 458; ii. 187; (4.) English civil and ecclesiastical, ii. 187, 210, 313, 343, 350; (5.) Scottish, i. 254; ii. 77. *See* Statutes; Magistrate.
Lawson, John, i. 227.
Layman, A (Sir W. Domville), ii. 357. *See* Domville.
Lechford, Thomas, i. 236.
Le Clerc, John, ii. 111; quoted, i. 225; ii. 178; referred to, i. 57, 288; ii. 202, 229, 244.
Lee, John, ii. 77, 337; i. 472.
—— Robert, ii. 98.
—— Samuel, ii. 334, 339; referred to, i. 293, 463; ii. 45, 348.
Leeke, William, ii. 339.
Legislation. *See* Magistrate.

Leicester Prize Essays, and answer thereto, ii. 378, 403.
Leighton, Robert, ii. 75, 320; i. 420.
Lent, fasting in, ii. 425.
Leo, Emperor, i. 178, 363; ii. 302.
—— Emperor, styled the Philosopher, i. 355, 421.
—— de Modena, ii. 181.
Leslie, Henry, ii. 330.
L'Estrange, Hamon, i. 200, 351, 364, 395.
Leusden, John, ii. 19.
Levites, duties of, i. 176; ii. 107, 227-8.
Lewis, Tayler, i. 438.
——— Thomas, ii. 172.
Ley, John, i. 193; quoted, 207; referred to, 179, 245, 256, 265, 351, 442.
Leydecker, Dr, ii. 448-9.
Leyden, controversy at, ii. 6.
Libertines, i. 205.
Liberty, Christian, i. 192; ii. 377, 381; religious, i. 133, 150, 153, 234, 267. *See* Magistrate.
Libraries, public, ii. 371, 403.
Liebetrut, F., ii. 438.
Lightfoot, John, ii. 19; quoted, i. 229; referred to, ii. 130, 221, 320.
Lilwall, John, ii. 409.
Limborch, Philip, ii. 118, 179, 184.
Limoges, fire at, ii. 432.
Lingard, John, i. 448, 451; ii. 331.
Linus, i. 224, 276, 281; ii. 8, 103.
Lipsius, R. A., i. 120, 319.
Literary men, ii. 341.
Lithgow, James R., ii. 437.
Liturgies, Jewish, ii. 319.
Liturgy of the Church of England, use of the Decalogue in the, i. 138, 146, 169, 215, 240, 391, 395, 412, 413, 424, 440; ii. 101, 104, 122, 124, 173, 193, 244, 273, 347, 349, 379, 384.
Liverpool, meeting at, ii. 367.
Locke, John, quoted, ii. 36; referred to, i. 394; ii. 118.
——— Joseph, ii. 341.
Lodenstevn, Jodocus van, ii. 139.
Loens, Robertus, i. 145.
London, Sunday in, i. 413; ii. 233, 234, 245, 334; Great Fire of, 161.
——— Mr, ii. 140.
Longitude, difference of, in relation to Sabbath-observance, i. 462; ii. 243, 458, 462.
Long Parliament, i. 163, 187, 200, 207, 226, 229, 230, 234, 235, 266, 453; ii. 308.
Lord, Eleazar, i. 437.
Lord's-day, meaning of, i. 105 *n*, 265, 333; ii. 375; not identified in Scripture with the first day of the week, i. 106; ii. 53, 120, 145, 179, 256, 265, 451; origin of its observance, i. 106, 131, 132; ii. 2, 28, 85, 296, 370, 385; why there was no controversy between the Jewish and Gentile Christians about its observance, ii. 22, 199; opinion that its observance was imposed by apostolic precept or example, i. 137, 141, 161, 165, 166, 168, 170, 177, 186, 203, 205, 210, 215, 218, 240, 247, 271, 333, 376, 379, 455-6, 475; ii. 3, 7, 8, 18, 28, 31, 35, 38, 81, 83, 85, 118, 141, 142, 143, 154, 170, 177, 189, 226, 230, 244, 255-8, 334, 370, 385, 388, 391-2, 394, 438, 457; why not expressly appointed by them to be observed, ii. 191; opinion that it was and is voluntarily observed by Christians, i. 126, 157, 158, 163, 223, 371; ii. 12, 18, 73, 119, 120, 135, 145, 179, 184, 198, 262, 291, 331-3, 337, 347-386, 392-3, 401, 417, 422-432, 438, 443, 450; opinion that it is observed by Ecclesiastical authority, i. 143, 145, 160, 163, 165, 169, 170, 177, 181, 186; ii. 11, 12, 52, 54, 80, 120, 135, 164, 226, 410; assemblies on it in the early ages of the Church, i. 110, 170, 320, 325, 331, 335, 337-44, 360; ii. 153, 155, 156, 158, 196, 255, 297, 300; no such assemblies mentioned by Paul, 178; the testing question, "Dominicum servasti?" alleged to have been put to the early martyrs, i. 154, 297; when does the day begin and end? i. 206, 252, 254; ii. 32, 385; may it be altered from Sunday? i. 141, 165, 166, 186, 209, 441, 455; ii. 2, 81, 84, 119, 121, 127, 135, 200, 225; not called the Sabbath in Scripture, i. 231, 246; ii. 146, 453;

never confounded with, or styled, the Sabbath by the ante-Nicene Fathers, i. 125, 160, 168, 170, 177, 184, 196-8, 257, 297-301; ii. 5, 12, 55, 118, 129, 146, 160, 206-301; not called the Sabbath except by the British and their descendants, i. 354; reasons assigned by the Fathers for its observance, i. 125, 223, 320, 336, 347, 353, 363-4, 456, 475; ii. 4, 145, 333, 383, 393; does the Fourth Commandment apply to it? i. 159, 160, 162, 165, 170, 181, 185, 198, 205, 227, 264, 265, 270, 411, 442, 455, 457-8, 477; ii. 5, 7, 28, 35, 51, 54, 153, 161, 167, 186; opinion that it is the Sabbath, i. 145, 202, 205, 227, 257, 340-2, 401; ii. 6, 83, 140, 157, 160, 176, 182, 291, 325, 329-31, 334-7, 338-47, 395, 414-17, 448, 459, 465; opinion that it is not the Sabbath, i. 131, 134, 159, 162, 165, 170, 181, 203, 223, 247, 304, 310-69, 410, 435, 455-7; ii. 56, 101, 108, 127, 135, 145, 256, 269, 332-4, 337, 347-94, 398, 414, 417-31, 437, 438, 439, 443, 454-64, 477; contrasted with the Sabbath, i. 181, 333, 334; ii. 10, 383; whether it may properly be styled the Sabbath, or the Christian Sabbath, i. 193-9, 203, 229, 231, 240, 245, 257, 264, 265, 349-51, 460; ii. 31, 72, 129, 138, 146, 193, 334; when first so called? i. 459; festive character of, i. 133, 141, 145, 316, 331, 333-4, 357; ii. 25, 26, 33, 55, 130, 154, 156, 197, 207, 439, 441; how to be spent, i. 142, 165, 172, 231, 233, 242, 267, 414, 434; ii. 13, 25, 31, 55, 75, 85, 152, 158, 176, 188, 194-7, 217, 232, 240, 246, 257, 324, 325, 377; austerity and wearisome exercises deprecated, ii. 15, 130, 159, 207, 383, 396, 403-9, 436, 439—*see* Worship; Recreation,; reasons for continuing to observe it, whatever its origin or authority, i. 168; ii. 119, 122, 156, 190, 199, 230, 240, 245, 249, 257, 267, 284, 349, 352, 362, 374, 376, 381, 391, 398-9, 404, 407-8, 411, 419, 420, 421, 425, 428, 434, 464; the utility of observing it as a Sabbath questioned, ii. 292, 302, 303; how observed in England, &c.—*see* England, &c.; prosperity said to be a reward of its observance, ii. 168, 431; English law and usage as to the sitting of courts of justice on, ii. 210. *See* Days; Sabbath; Laws; Resurrection.

Lord's Prayer, ii. 274, 288, 317.

Lord's Supper, ii. 154, 182, 200, 201, 293, 348, 386.

Lorimer, J. G., ii. 340; quoted, 184; referred to, i. 241.

Love-feasts, i. 216, 335.; ii. 226, 265, 386.

Lucian, i. 221, 224, 277.

Lünekogel, ii. 119, 134.

Luther, Martin, i. 126, 203, 269, 364, 383, 388, 403, 405, 476; ii. 4, 97, 350, 352, 386.

Macarius, ii. 4.

Macbeth, John, ii. 330, 414.

M'Caul, A., i. 438.

M'Causland, Dominick, i. 438.

Maccovius, John, ii. 139.

M'Creery, Hon. Mr, ii. 415.

M'Crie, Thomas, *primus*, quoted, i. 266 *n*; referred to, ii. 97.

——— Thomas, *secundus*, ii. 341, 410; quoted, i. 337; referred to, 241; ii. 166, 433.

Macdonald, Donald, i. 438.

Macfarlan, Duncan, ii. 338, 340, 433.

M'Farlane, Patrick, ii. 410.

M'Kean, William, ii. 359.

Mackenzie, W. B., ii. 345.

Macknight, Dr, i. 92; ii. 205.

Macnair, Robert, ii. 395, 410.

Macnaught, John, i. 190 *n*.

Macnaughtan, John, ii. 346.

M'Neile, Hugh, ii. 345, 372.

Maçon, Council of, i. 178; ii. 335.

M'Owan, Peter, ii. 342, 343, 410.

Macphail's Ecclesiastical Journal, i. 438.

Macrobius, i. 284, 291.

Madagascar, i. 289.

Magistrate, duty of, in regard to religion, i. 133, 150, 153, 165, 234, 251, 255, 261, 375, 441; ii. 54, 60, 69, 97, 135, 196, 316, 320, 324, 338, 339, 367, 368, 391,

395, 402, 411-29, 433-5; duty of obedience to, 69. *See* Laws.
Maguire, Robert, ii. 379, 394.
Mail-coaches on Sunday, ii. 248. *See* Post-office.
Maimonides, i. 477; ii. 20, 445.
Maitland, S. R., ii. 375.
Manchester Botanic Garden, ii. 368; police force, 397; Duke of, 236.
Manichees, i. 424.
Manna, the giving of, i. 6, 155, 205, 215, 293, 347, 353, 403, 457 *n*; ii. 47, 48, 100, 106, 110, 112, 116, 132, 218, 250.
Mansfield, Lord, ii. 210.
Mant, Miss, ii. 330.
——— Richard, ii. 336; referred to, 334, 388; quoted, i. 255, 256, 263.
Marah, Sabbath-law supposed to have been given at, i. 478.
Marcionites, i. 424.
Marck, John, ii. 165.
Maresius, Samuel, ii. 139.
Marjoribanks, Alex., ii. 348, 312.
Markets on Sunday, i. 359, 469-472; ii. 337, 339, 343, 373.
Marriage, ii. 61; celebration of, on Sunday, i. 141.
Marsh, Herbert, ii. 214, 331.
Marshal, Mr, i. 229.
Marshall, Judge, ii. 437.
Martin, Mr, M.P., ii. 238.
Martyr, Peter, i. 132, 172; ii. 54.
Martyrs, Acts of the, i. 297-304.
Mary, Queen of Scots, reign of, i. 467-8, 473.
Masques, i. 467, 468, 480.
Massachusetts, i. 251, 253; ii. 411-435.
Masson, David, quoted, ii. 260.
Master and Servant. *See* Servants.
Mather, Cotton, referred to, ii. 27.
Maurice, F. D., ii. 360, 410.
Maxson, Wm. B., ii. 418.
Mayer, ii. 134.
May-games and May-poles, i. 147, 446, 454.
Mearns, Peter, ii. 340, 356; reply to, 356.
Mede, Joseph, i. 154, 432; ii. 40, 145, 157.
Melancholy, religious, ii. 147.
Melancthon, Philip, i. 129; ii. 386; quoted, i. 389, 396, 410; referred to, 269; ii. 4, 350.
Melito, i. 395; ii. 260.
Mellet, Louis Victor, ii. 443; referred to, i. 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 391, 394.
Mercy, works of, i. 111, 133, 180, 213, 216, 230, 233, 405, 417; ii. 26, 50, 181, 361, 445.
Merryweather, F. S., ii. 341, 410.
Meursius, i. 283.
Meyer, John, ii. 172.
Mexicans, i. 114, 289.
Michaelis, Sir John D., ii. 214; quoted, i. 407; referred to, 216, 241; ii. 167, 212, 303.
Michelet, Mons., i. 384, 388.
Michigan, ii. 433.
Middleton, Conyers, ii. 211.
Milan, edict of, i. 356.
Milk, selling of, i. 454.
Miller, George, ii. 331.
——— Hugh, i. 437, 438, 439, 290; ii. 345, 379.
——— James, ii. 343; i. 199, 427; ii. 372, 393.
——— Dr S., ii. 415.
Mills, John, ii. 443.
Milman, Henry Hart, i. 241; ii. 167.
Milner, John, ii. 332.
Milton, John, ii. 46; quoted, i. 228; ii. 180; referred to, i. 197; 394, 395, 407, 442, 475, 476; ii. 35, 179, 182, 184, 200, 260, 292, 352, 410, 458.
Mischna, the, i. 398; ii. 165.
Mistranslations, i. 85, 86, 92, 119, 292, 303, 309, 318, 323, 341-2, 344, 349, 407; ii. 299, 300, 461.
Moffat, J. M., ii. 245.
Money not handled by the Jews on the Sabbath, i. 223; ii. 180.
Montacute, Sir Sydney, i. 480.
Montanists, i. 330, 332, 464; ii. 55.
Moon, its phases considered as the origin of the week, i. 190, 259, 288, 290; ii. 356.
Moral actions distinguished from useful, i. 222.
——— laws and duties, meaning of, i. 242, 389, 419, 440; ii. 7, 82, 326, 344; not discriminated from positive in the early Hebrew Scriptures, ii. 255, 379. *See* Fourth Commandment; Positive.
More, Hannah, ii. 323.

Morer, Thomas, ii. 119; i. 121, 136, 145, 287.
Morton, Bishop, i. 425.
——— Daniel O., ii. 415.
——— J. W., ii. 418.
Moses, law of. *See* Law of Moses.
Mosheim, John Lawrence, i. 297, 301, 315; ii. 438.
Mott, Lucretia, ii. 424, 429, 431.
Mullois, Abbé, ii. 442.
Munier, D., ii. 443.
Murphy, James, ii. 437.
Murray, Regent, i. 467.
Murrough, Mr, ii. 364.
Musculus, Wolfgang, i. 131, 394; ii. 54, 93.
Museums, public, ii. 313, 399, 444.
Music, ii. 300, 309, 324, 364, 366, 372, 401, 403; use of instrumental, in worship, i. 261.
Myers, Mr, i. 394.

NAPIER, Joseph, ii. 372.
Napoleon I., ii. 322, 329.
National character, ii. 365.
——— Gallery, ii. 368.
——— Sunday League, ii. 313.
——— Sunday League Record, ii. 378, 313; referred to, 355, 365, 407, 409.
Natural religion, ii. 363.
Nature, light of, i. 211, 231, 239. *See* Law of Nature.
Nayler, B. S., ii. 379, 410.
Nazarenes, i. 319; ii. 63 *n.*
Neal, Daniel, i. 151, 152, 163, 228, 231, 234, 235, 448, 451.
Neale, Edward Vansittart, ii. 350, 410; referred to, i. 122, 124, 125, 145.
Neander, John Augustus William, ii. 438; quoted, i. 332; ii. 23, 179; referred to, i. 121, 122, 123, 125, 138, 297, 315, 331; ii. 385, 386.
Necessity, works of, i. 49, 57, 61, 111, 133, 141, 144, 149, 229, 233, 405, 416, 421; ii. 25, 181, 222, 361, 403; principles for determining what are such, i. 250; ii. 33, 434-6.
Nehemiah's treatment of the Tyrian traders, i. 36, 261; ii. 48, 456.
Nelson, Robert, ii. 156; Supplement to, 165.
Netherlands, i. 157, 159, 162, 163, 217-18, 441; ii. 1-6, 10, 27, 137, 447, 448, 459.
Nevill's Constitutions, ii. 347.
New England, i. 236, 249, 479; ii. 32, 307, 411-437.
Newhaven Colony, Blue Laws of, i. 235, 252.
New Monthly Magazine, ii. 306, 433.
New-moons, i. 101; ii. 109.
New Plymouth Colony, a law of, i. 252.
"New Testament Sabbath, The," ii. 114.
New York, ii. 419, 433.
Newspapers, Sunday, ii. 244, 323, 334, 343.
Newstead, Robert, ii. 442.
Newton, Bishop, ii. 211, 286.
Nicholson, Bishop, ii. 372.
Niemeyer, H. A., i. 128.
Night assemblies of early Christians, i. 296, 304-5.
Nisbet, Alexander, i. 419.
N. M. P., ii. 346.
Noah, i. 4, 108, 175, 278, 288; ii. 203, 251; the so-called seven precepts of, i. 225; ii. 204, 385.
Noel, Baptist W., ii. 339, 341.
North American Review, ii. 414.
North British Review, ii. 341, 347, 394; quoted, i. 242, 460-1; referred to, 231, 409; ii. 393.
Northbrooke, John, i. 139.
Notes and Queries quoted, i. 353, 480.
Nott, Dr, i. 354.
Nova Scotia, ii. 437.
Novatian, ii. 4.
Numbers, why reckoned by tens, i. 258.
Nundinæ, i. 287; ii. 373.

OBEDIENCE to authorities, duty of, ii. 69.
Ockford, James, i. 226, 479.
Oehler referred to, ii. 438.
Offor, George, quoted, ii. 80.
Ogden, Samuel, ii. 268.
Ogdoas of the Gnostics, i. 342, 352.
Ohio, ii. 433.
Old Testament, figurative application of, to Christian duties and institutions, i. 199, 227, 360-5, 370, 460 *n.* *See* Law of Moses.
Oliver, Alex. ii. 343; quoted, 23; referred to, i. 113; ii. 118.

Olshausen quoted, ii. 82, 179, 266.
Omnibus-driving, ii. 343, 406.
O'Neill, William, ii. 346.
Onesimus, Bishop, ii. 260.
Origen, i. 121, 345, 124, 177, 196, 299, 309, 353; ii. 129, 335.
Orleans, Council of, ii. 302.
Orme, William, ii. 16, 28, 35.
Orr, John, ii. 233.
Orton, Job, ii. 213.
Ould, Fielding, ii. 340.
Outhovius, J. G., ii. 172.
Ovid, i. 224, 276, 286.
Owen, John, ii. 22; quoted, i. 269, 273, 284, 428; ii. 15, 116; referred to, i. 113, 164, 398; ii. 60, 211, 427, 459; answers to, i. 27, 35.
"Oxford M.A.," ii. 363, 410.

PAGITT'S "Heresiography," i. 300, 431.
Paisley coffee-room, ii. 394.
Palestine, weather in, i. 407; ii. 223.
Paley, William, ii. 248, 464; quoted, i. 111; ii. 421; referred to, i. 121, 327, 329, 394; ii. 179, 286. 303, 333, 351, 352, 372, 388, 458; answers to, ii. 259-268, 329, 348, 464.
Palmer, Herbert, i. 237. *See* Cawdrey.
——— Sir Roundell, ii. 364.
——— Samuel, ii. 325.
Parasceve. *See* Preparation.
Pareus, David, i. 152, 203, 425; ii. 93.
Paris, Sunday in, ii. 400, 403. *See* France.
Parker, Matthew, i. 127; ii. 371.
——— Theodore, ii. 418, 424-9.
——— W., i. 236.
Parkhurst, Henry M., ii. 417.
Parkinson, Henry W., ii. 379.
——— William, ii. 418.
Parliament, Reports of Select Committees of House of Commons, ii. 313, 337; Bills in, 323. *See* Long Parliament; Statutes.
Parr, Richard, his Life of Archbishop Usher, i. 263.
——— Samuel, ii. 10, 286.
Parry, Richard, ii. 206.
——— William, ii. 286, 321.
Patriarchal Sabbath, treatise on the, ii. 74, 455—*see* Sabbath; Saturday; patriarchal worship, ii. 103; is the patriarchal dispensation binding on Christians? i. 404, 332; ii. 51, 61, 127, 189, 190, 193, 207, 253, 259, 349, 352, 370.
Patrick, Simon, i. 478; ii. 132.
Paul, St, i. 79-102, 365, 386; ii. 333; his visit to Troas—*see* Troas; his injunction to the Corinthians to lay by alms—*see* Corinth; on the observance of days—*see* Days; on the Decalogue, i. 90, 94, 99; ii. 95, 98; continued after his conversion to observe the Law of Moses, i. 88, 89, 92, 108, 343; ii. 62, 63, 144, 382; never refers to a primeval Sabbath, ii. 31, 259; did he observe the Lord's-day? i. 85, 215; ii. 31, 230, 255-65, 293, 427.
Paullinus, ii. 4.
Peabody, A. P., ii. 415.
Pearson, John, ii. 17, 143, 297; i. 123.
Peckham's Constitutions, ii. 347.
Pennsylvania, ii. 411, 437.
Percy, Bishop, quoted, i. 468.
Pérennès, François, ii. 441, 322.
Perkins, William, i. 203, 209.
Perowne, J. J. S., i. 438.
Persians, i. 114, 287.
Pezelius, Christophorus, ii. 5.
Pfeiffer, Augustus, ii. 107.
Pharisees, i. 48, 49, 52, 59, 62, 63, 64, 180, 216, 241, 243; ii. 33, 171, 304, 446.
Phelps, A. A., ii. 415; quoted, i. 344; referred to, 352.
Philippsohn, Ludwig, ii. 443.
Philips, Sir Robert, i. 452.
Phillips, Ambrose, i. 264.
Philo Judæus, i. 117; quoted, i. 289, 293-5, 351; ii. 69, 180, 229; referred to, i. 113, 214, 221, 224, 225, 279, 283, 284, 291; ii. 42, 112, 113, 158, 164, 166, 178.
Philostratus, i. 221.
Phœnicians, ii. 219.
Physicians, i. 417; ii. 446.
Physiology in relation to the Sabbath, i. 241-2; ii. 343, 367, 396.
Pickard, James, ii. 372, 410.
Pillsbury, Parker, ii. 430.
Pirret, David, ii. 343, 410.
Places, holy, do not exist under

the Gospel. ii. 48, 51; profanation of, 461. *See* Holy.
Placette, John La, ii. 126.
Planetary origin of names of the days of the week, i. 279, 285, 289.
Plato, ii. 65, 197.
Plays on Sunday, i. 480. *See* Theatre.
Pleasure, ambiguity of the word, i. 206; what is meant by the Hebrew noun so translated in Isa. lviii. 13? 171, 206, 231, 234, 270, 398 *n*, 427-8; ii. 85, 111, 159, 164, 207, 454, 461; recreations called "*works* of pleasure" by Cawdrey, i. 240; festive character of the Sabbath and Lord's-day—*see* Sabbath; Lord's-day; Recreation.
Pliny the elder, quoted i. 74.
——— the younger, i. 113, 295; ii. 19, 154, 210, 335, 357.
Plitt, Theodore, ii. 342, 438.
Plutarch, ii. 164.
Pocklington, John, i. 187, 264; answers to, 194, 228, 240, 460.
Poems on the Sabbath, ii. 329 *n*.
Policemen, ii. 343, 397 *n*.
Polygamy, i. 343, 391.
Polynesians, i. 114, 289.
Pompey, i. 286.
Pooly, Christopher, ii. 58.
Poor, collections for, i. 335; ii. 181, 295. *See* Corinth.
Pope, John, ii. 318, 321.
Popham, Chief-Justice, i. 147.
Porter, Edmund, ii. 455.
Porteus, Beilby, ii. 235, 245, 323; i. 241.
Positive laws and duties, ii. 11, 82, 255, 326, 379.
Post-office, ii. 248, 337, 341, 342, 343, 358, 359, 360, 412, 418, 434.
Powell, Baden, ii. 350, 356, 378, 395, 410; quoted, i. 79, 284, 365, 370, 411, 412; ii. 259; referred to, i. 110, 119, 120, 121, 125, 317, 318, 409, 424, 437, 462; ii. 433, 98, 157, 385.
Pratt, John H., i. 438.
Prayer, i. 48, 51, 338; public or social; ii. 270-91, 315-20. *See* Worship.
Preaching on the Sabbath not instituted by Moses, ii. 218, 227, 229.
Prejudice ascribed by theologians to their adversaries, ii. 184; distorting effects of, 197.
Preparation, day of, i. 108, 176, 334 *n*; ii. 14.
Presbyterian Review, i. 266; ii. 157, 334, 338, 340, 433.
Presbyterians. *See* Puritans.
Prescott, William H., referred to, i. 114.
Price, Richard, referred to, ii. 211.
Prideaux, Humphrey, referred to, i. 38; ii. 166, 317.
——— John, i. 164, 454; ii. 5; referred to, i. 186, 451, 458, 465; ii. 2, 388; answer to, i. 207.
Priestley, Joseph, ii. 291, 315, 321; i. 344, 386.
Primerose, David, i. 183, 463, 240.
Princeton Review, ii. 414, 417.
Prisons, ii. 337. *See* Criminals.
Prize Essays, ii. 341, 343.
Profanation, meaning of, ii. 460; of a day, different from misspending it, 462. *See* Holy.
Professional men, ii. 341.
Proleptical interpretation of Gen. ii. 3—i. 107, 175, 221; ii. 47, 147, 203, 251.
Prophecies concerning the Sabbath, i. 40-43, 46; ii. 109.
Proselytes, Jewish, i. 28 *n*, 40, 41, 221, 224; ii. 64, 181, 204, 220, 385.
Prospective Review, i. 437.
Prosper, ii. 4.
Prosperity said to follow Sabbath-observance, ii. 168, 431.
Proudhon, P. J., ii. 442.
Prudentius, ii. 4.
Prynne, William, i. 227, 254, 479; referred to, 163, 164, 187, 452-3.
Public-houses, ii. 334, 337, 343. *See* Drunkenness.
Public opinion, ii. 398.
Purim, Feast of, ii. 84.
Puritans and their followers, i. 127, 139, 140, 146, 160, 161, 163, 186, 187, 193, 200, 203, 207, 210, 228-34, 236, 237, 244, 246, 249, 254, 255, 262, 265, 364, 383, 391, 395, 415, 427, 428, 429, 434, 444, 448, 449, 455, 459, 461, 462, 466, 475; ii. 13, 28, 31, 36, 82, 92, 98, 127, 131, 137-41, 158, 170, 186, 188, 202, 209, 213, 215, 216, 218, 248, 269, 307, 312, 329, 354-17, 364,

371, 388, 395, 402, 417, 425, 442, 447, 448, 450, 458, 464.
Pythagoreans, i. 279, 283, 291.
Pynchon, Wm., i. 254, 476, 478, 479.

QUAKERS, ii. 70, 411, 415, 417, 429, 450.
Quarta-Deciman controversy, i. 326.
Quarterly Review, i. 235; ii. 343.

RABBIES, Jewish, i. 7, 203, 205, 214, 220, 223; ii. 45, 133, 204, 221, 373, 443.
Ragueneau, Dennis, i. 386.
Railways, ii. 337, 340, 341, 342, 343, 350, 351, 352, 359, 406, 435.
Ratisbon, Diet of, ii. 217.
Ravanel, Peter, ii. 139.
Reason of a command, whether its universality makes the law universally binding, ii. 48, 83-85, 144, 157, 254.
Recreation, i. 150, 235, 262; ii. 215-18, 308, 314; two sorts of, i. 241; on the Sabbath, i. 111, 176, 235, 240, 294; ii. 340, 439; on Sunday, i. 123, 137, 139, 140, 141, 145, 147, 149, 171, 174, 178, 186, 192, 216, 229, 230, 231, 240, 267, 294, 417, 435, 444-51; ii. 12, 13, 26, 30, 33, 123, 130, 135, 137, 145, 159, 165, 196, 217, 246, 258, 304-15, 334, 344, 365, 371, 391, 396-408, 439, 441, 453, 460; spiritual, ii. 33, 76.
Reformers, Continental, i. 126-135, 382, 172, 178, 203, 221, 249, 461; ii. 1, 3, 81, 200, 336, 346, 355, 359, 364, 371, 380, 386, 390, 420; British, i. 135-9, 178, 189, 131, 355, 364, 371, 380, 428. *See* Luther, Calvin, &c.
Refreshment, the Sabbath intended for, i. 13, 240, 399; lawful on the Lord's-day, ii. 25, 125, 130, 249, 367. *See* Recreation.
Reichel, Charles P., ii. 380, 268; i. 412; answers to, ii. 346, 306, 384.
Reid, James Seaton, ii. 342.
Reland, Hadrian, ii. 304.
Remember, meaning of the word in the Fourth Commandment, i. 232, 374, 376; ii. 133.
Rest, need of, ii. 65, 68, 216, 240, 245, 249, 302, 354; distinguished from idleness, i. 142; spiritual, ii. 1—*see* Spiritual Sabbath; was a part of the Jewish worship, i. 396-402; ii. 1, 166; whether the sole duty prescribed in the Fourth Commandment? i. 115, 168, 240, 377, 395-402; ii. 2, 68, 78, 107-11, 112, 113, 146, 164, 188, 194, 204, 215, 218, 229, 244, 269, 348, 358, 382, 449, 456, 458, 460-2; whether it is a religious rite of Christianity to rest on Sunday, i. 166, 168, 171, 172, 183, 189, 209, 214, 217, 230, 261, 415, 419-20; ii. 11, 26, 30, 81, 85, 102, 111, 119, 127, 137, 146, 147, 164, 166, 170, 188.
Resurrection of Jesus, in relation to the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, i. 111, 141, 161, 165, 177, 186, 205, 215, 231, 233, 257, 270, 323-4, 333, 354, 358, 361-4, 379, 408, 475; ii. 4, 17, 43, 53, 56, 83, 85, 101, 102, 143, 257, 382, 389, 451.
Revelation, Book of, ii. 265, 266.
Reynolds, Dr, i. 197.
Rice, N. L., ii. 417.
Richardson, Chief-Justice, i. 447, 451.
Richson, Charles, ii. 97, 98.
Ridgley, Thomas, ii. 175.
Rimbault, Edward F., i. 480.
River, the sabbatic, ii. 19.
Rivers, traffic on, ii. 335, 340, 343.
Rivetus, Andrew, i. 162, 218; referred to, 172, 258, 281, 394, 442; ii. 29, 93; answers to, i. 163, 209, 240.
Robartes, Humphrey, i. 140.
Robertson, F. W., ii. 376, 381, 410; i. 331, 414.
——— Joseph, i. 467.
Rogers, Henry, ii. 346, 396, 410.
——— Thomas, i. 146, 149, 212.
Roman Catholics, doctrine and practice of, as to the Sabbath, Lord's-day, and Festivals, i. 124, 125, 126, 135, 137, 151, 371, 383, 387, 389, 396, 448; ii. 34, 121, 185, 198, 237, 238, 316, 331, 369, 383, 390, 391, 393, 424, 441-2.
Romans, ancient, i. 224, 276, 278, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 305, 359; Roman laws, 121, 134, 171, 177, 223, 257, 322, 355-9, 394, 421; ii. 12, 56, 154, 296, 301, 394, 398.

Rosenmüller, E. F. C., i. 7, 29, 398.
Rothe, Richard, ii. 439, 440.
Routh, Martin Joseph, i. 325, 334.
Rufinus, i. 124.
Ruinart, Thierry, i. 301.
Rule distinguished from law, i. 384, 394 *n*.
Rupp referred to, ii. 419.
Rushworth, John, referred to, i. 163, 228, 230, 447, 452.
Russell, Francis, ii. 354, 410.
Russian name of Sunday, i. 354.
Rutherford, Samuel, i. 229, 388.

SABBATARIAN defined, i. 461, 465.
Sabbatarians, a sect formerly so named. *See* Seventh-day Baptists.
Sabbath means rest, i. 115, 165, 194, 195, 377, 415, 419; ii. 79, 146; used sometimes as a proper and sometimes as a common name, i. 459, 462; ii. 146.
I. PRIMEVAL or PATRIARCHAL:
—opinions and arguments for, i. 109, 129, 134, 136, 161, 162, 167, 201, 203, 218, 258, 273, 290, 403; ii. 81, 82, 83, 92, 130, 132, 140, 141, 142, 157, 175, 188, 193, 198, 203, 206, 207, 210, 242, 259, 325, 329, 335, 336, 340, 341, 347, 352, 395, 477; opinions and arguments against, i. 109, 145, 157, 164, 167, 175, 189, 203, 218, 224, 269, 273, 292, 320, 326, 330-2, 422; ii. 5, 47, 48, 51, 61, 64, 78, 112, 114, 115, 119, 126, 135, 158, 164, 211, 251, 268, 296-8, 360, 363, 384, 390, 456; argument for it from God's example, i. 171, 402, 476; ii. 11, 39, 51, 66, 83, 110, 126, 142, 157; opinion that it was instituted after the Fall, i. 476, 478; ii. 38; supposed by some to have been a day of religious commemoration, but not of rest, i. 219, 269, 403; ii. 1, 9, 30, 82, 102, 146, 188, 294, 476; whether observed by the heathen of old, and now to be observed by Gentile Christians—*see* Gentiles; whether it was the first or the seventh day of the week, i. 155, 462 *n*, 463, 207; ii. 40, 73, 74, 86, 88, 92, 101, 168, 174, 175, 203, 207, 208, 213, 244, 339, 366; can the seventh day in order from the day of God's rest be ascertained? i. 294; ii. 88, 132, 462-3; are Christians subject to the law of the? i. 404, 332; ii. 51, 61, 127, 189, 190, 253, 259, 349, 352, 370.
II. MOSAIC, considered (1.) as a day of rest and refreshment, i. 11, 13, 25, 136, 180, 215, 220, 240, 312, 395; ii. 49, 170, 188, 248, 341, 343, 352-4, 358, 362, 367; (2.) as commemorative of the creation, i. 399; ii. 11, 48, 78, 143, 170, 219; (3.) as commemorative of Israel's deliverance from Egypt, i. 25, 154, 378; ii. 11, 49, 52, 103, 135, 143, 170; (4.) as a sign between Jehovah and Israel, i. 15, 44, 154, 220, 378, 400-2; ii. 49, 63, 78, 103, 135, 253; and (5.) as a shadow or type of a spiritual Sabbath, i. 124, 135, 137, 170, 325, 327, 349, 365-9, 370, 378, 379, 400, 401, 403, 457-8, 478; ii. 1, 50, 52, 72, 106, 111, 119, 170, 211, 259, 300, 346, 393, 395, 450, 457; what meant by keeping it holy—*see* Holy; Rest; distinction between *profaning* it and *misspending* the sanctified time, i. 397; with what degree of strictness were the Jews required to keep it? i. 405, 418, 462; Philo's opinion how it should be spent, i. 294; was and is festively observed by the Jews, i. 46, 171, 176, 204, 206, 216, 227, 229, 241, 243, 251, 294, 367, 368, 399, 417; ii. 19, 79, 112, 163, 164, 195, 219, 227, 304, 399; kept from sunset to sunset, i. 32, 57, 86, 252, 268, 478, 479; ii. 40, 58, 73, 181, 200, 220, 253, 293, 294, 373, 385; this fact questioned, ii. 91; double sacrifices on—*see* Sacrifices; was the holding of religious assemblies on it a prescribed duty? i. 110, 116, 168, 377, 396-

402 ; ii. 19, 68, 78, 107-11, 112-13, 141, 146, 164, 166, 194, 204, 215, 218, 229, 244, 348, 358, 382, 449, 456, 458, 460-2 ; circumcision lawful on—*see* Circumcision ; works of necessity and mercy lawful—*see* Necessity ; Mercy ; whether a moral or a positive institution—*see* Fourth Commandment ; capital punishment of its profanation, i. 15, 18, 22, 252, 421 ; ii. 60, 69, 219, 224, 225, 227, 252 ; prophecies concerning it, i. 40-43, 46 ; ii. 109 ; doctrine and practice of Jesus and the apostles in regard to it—*see* Jesus—Apostles—Paul ; maxims, that "the son of man is lord even of the Sabbath day," i. 50, 57, 180, 221 ; ii. 113, 171 ; and that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," i. 57, 221 ; ii. 50, 61, 113, 171, 197, 356, 399, 402 ; duty of its observance subordinate to that of practising kindness, purity, and justice, i. 40, 50, 180, 405-6 ; ii. 171, 178, 230, 402 ; whether its observance was and is incumbent on the heathen and the Gentile Christians—*see* Gentiles—Seventh-day Baptists ; was kept by the early Christian Jews, i. 168, 215, 270, 318, 334, 342-8, 457, 462 ; ii. 12, 22, 55, 82, 90, 145, 153, 155, 178, 359, 383, 385 ; is still kept in Abyssinia, &c., i. 343, 346, 359 ; ii. 419 ; and by the Seventh-day Baptists—*see* that head ; doctrine and practice of the Fathers, Schoolmen, Reformers, Church of England, Puritans, &c., respecting it—*see* those heads ; whether abrogated, i. 111, 129, 131 ; ii. 29, 31, 50, 52, 67, 161, 188, 199, 254, 298, 376, 209, 457 ; contrasted with the Lord's-day, i. 181, 333-4 ; ii. 10, 313 ; sabbaths of the land, or, sabbatical years, i. 21, 22, 33, 35 ; ii. 111, 126, 439, 458 ; "the second sabbath after the first," i. 61 ; ii. 356. *See* Saturday.

III. THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH, a non-scriptural name given by some to the Christian's rest from sin, and by others to the Lord's-day. *See* Spiritual Sabbath ; Lord's-day.

Sabbath Alliance, i. 387 ; ii. 347, 360, 387.

Sabbath-day's journey, i. 435 ; ii. 19, 26, 221, 453.

Sabbatic river, ii. 19.

——— years, i. 21, 22, 33, 35 ; ii. 111, 126, 439, 458.

Sacrifices, i. 39, 41, 42, 43 ; on the Sabbath, 23, 32, 33, 36, 45, 46, 49, 220, 223, 314, 320, 338, 365, 405, 422 ; ii. 21, 79, 109, 111, 112, 171, 224, 252, 364 ; Christian, i. 338, 351, 361.

Saller, W., i. 255.

Sallier, Claude, ii. 158 ; quoted, i. 283, 293.

Salmasius referred to, i. 258.

Salmon-fishing, i. 188, 465 ; ii. 106.

Salvador, J., ii. 442.

Samaritans, i. 170.

Sanctified. *See* Holy.

Sanctuary for man-slayers, ii. 460.

Sanderson, Robert, i. 184, 464 ; referred to, 428, 460 ; ii. 57, 120.

Sanitary laws of Moses, ii. 97.

Sardica, Council of, ii. 153.

Saturday the Jewish Sabbath-day, i. 233, 322, 347 ; whether specially appointed in the Fourth Commandment as the Sabbath-day, i. 140, 204, 227, 239, 247 ; ii. 35, 39, 44, 45, 51, 81, 87, 101, 104, 126, 127, 128, 133, 142, 160, 168, 194, 243, 349 ; was it the patriarchal Sabbath-day ? i. 155, 462 *n* ; ii. 40, 86, 92, 101, 168, 175, 203, 207, 244, 339, 366 ; whether ordered by Constantine to be observed by Christians, i. 357 ; exclusively called the Sabbath by the ancient Christians and most modern nations, i. 197-8, 348-54, 369, 458-9 ; ii. 129, 146, 370 ; cases in which the observance of the Lord's-day has been or is begun in the afternoon of, i. 252, 254 ; half-holiday on, ii. 405, 408. *See* Sabbath.

Saturn, worship of, i. 284, 286; ii. 219.
Saturninus, i. 302.
Savage, James, quoted, i. 253.
Scaliger quoted, i. 459.
Scenery, enjoyment of, ii. 33.
Schook, Martin, ii. 138.
Schoolmen, the, i. 125, 178, 181, 370; ii. 390.
Schwartz, Mr, ii. 119.
Science and Scripture, i. 437. *See* Geology.
Scobell's "Acts and Ordinances," i. 234, 235, 254, 453-4.
Scotland, i. 127, 188, 241, 254, 359, 391, 398; ii. 77, 158, 184, 248, 307, 337, 351-6, 360-3, 387, 390, 446, 458, 465-75, 442, 458.
Scott, Charles Henry, ii. 365.
——— Thomas, ii. 330.
Seabury, Samuel, i. 463; ii. 414.
Secker, Archbishop, ii. 213, 336, 388.
Sedgwick, Miss, ii. 315, 407.
Sedulius, ii. 4.
Seed, Jeremiah, ii. 315.
Seed-time, work in, i. 17, 405, 407; ii. 223.
Selden, John, i. 223, 478; referred to, i. 116, 221, 277, 287, 325, 335, 423, 458; ii. 205.
Sellers, William, ii. 35, 60, 61; i. 395.
Seneca, i. 116, 224; ii. 8, 65, 197.
Senegambia, i. 289.
Septenary institutions, i. 113; ii. 359, 373, 395.
Septuagint, i. 398, 416; ii. 454.
Sermons, whether preached in Moses's time, ii. 218, 227, 229.
Servants, i. 159, 161, 182, 217, 229, 235; ii. 65, 68, 258, 339, 361, 403.
Seven, the number, i. 5, 30, 37, 106, 175, 274, 279, 291, 341; ii. 441-2.
Seventh-day Baptists, i. 152, 157, 162, 226, 237, 267, 431, 443, 479; ii. 6, 10, 18, 35, 39, 57, 80, 86, 91, 167, 182, 185-7, 198, 200, 260, 387, 409-10, 412, 418-19, 433, 447; answers to, i. 166, 246, 255, 443, 479; ii. 6, 9, 24, 28, 30, 31, 39, 44, 45, 57, 80, 87, 92, 99, 114, 115, 140, 167, 186, 187, 202, 447, 456, 458, 462, 464. *See* Saturday.
Seventh-day Baptist Memorial, i. 268.
Sharp, John, ii. 141, 213, 336, 388; i. 394, 395, 460, 476.
Shelley, Sir J. V., ii. 364.
Shepard, Thomas, i. 249; referred to, 183, 247, 461, 429; ii. 29.
Shepherd, Mr, i. 430.
Sherlock, Bishop, i. 394, ii. 36.
Shew-bread, i. 21, 32, 33, 49, 180.
Shoa, i. 343.
Shuckford, Samuel, ii. 202.
Sign, the Sabbath considered as a i. 378, 401. *See* Sabbath.
Simeon, Charles, ii. 338.
Simon, R., i. 282.
Simpson, John, ii. 330.
Sinclair, W., Letter to, ii. 372.
Singing not mentioned by Justin Martyr as part of Christian worship, ii. 300; much practised in Germany, ii. 309. *See* Music.
Skipp, Edward, ii. 58.
Slack, Henry J., ii. 379, 410.
Slavery, i. 391.
Slaves, their rest on the Sabbath, i. 25, 161, 182; ii. 112, 216, 254.
Sleep, i. 240; ii. 14.
Sloth, whether condemned by the Fourth Commandment, i. 204, 379, 411; ii. 75, 84, 126.
Small, J., ii. 159, 459.
Smith, Herbert, ii. 334.
——— James, of Jordanhill, ii. 292.
——— John, ii. 100, 455; referred to, i. 462; ii. 45.
——— John Pye, i. 127, 437.
——— Wm., his Dictionary of the Bible, ii. 442; i. 282-3, 394, 438.
Smyth, Professor, ii. 417.
Sobriety, ii. 365. *See* Drunkenness.
Societies for promoting the observance of the Lord's-day, ii. 233, 337, 347.
Socinians, ii. 6.
Socrates the ecclesiastical historian, i. 346; ii. 56.
Sorignet, Abbé, i. 437.
Soto, Dominicus à, ii. 93.
South Carolina, ii. 433.
Southern Presbyterian Review, ii. 416.
Southey, Robert, referred to, i. 241, 308; quoted, ii. 30, 131, 322.
Sozomen, i. 357, 440.
Spalding quoted, i. 467.

Spanheim, sen. and jun. ii. 139, 448.
Spanish name of Saturday, i. 354.
Spencer, John, ii. 77, 455; referred to, 112, 113, 146, 164, 204, 205, 244, 348; answer to, 172.
Spener, Philip James, ii. 135, 136, 137.
Sperling, John, Letters to, ii. 374.
Spiliardus, ii. 5.
Spiritual Sabbath, i. 124, 132, 135, 137, 170, 177, 196-7, 325, 327, 339, 349-51, 365-9, 370, 378, 379, 400, 401, 403, 409, 457-8, 478; ii. 1, 50, 52, 72, 106, 111, 119, 129, 170, 211, 259, 300 *n*, 393, 395, 450, 457.
Spittlehouse, J., i. 255.
Sports on the Lord's-day, i. 206, 229, 230, 262, 467, 469; ii. 13, 14, 76, 127, 137, 159, 308. *See* Recreation.
Sports, Book of, i. 152, 163, 171, 173, 178, 183, 213, 227, 248, 256, 265, 425, 444-54; ii. 18, 30, 106, 123, 124, 131, 141, 246, 307, 332, 333, 343.
Sprint, John, i. 151.
Stackhouse, Thomas, ii. 186.
Stage-coaches, ii. 323, 334, 372.
Stair, Lord, quoted, i. 394.
Standish, Henry, ii. 332.
Stanley, Arthur Penrhyn, i. 343.
——— Lord, 364.
Statutes:—*Anglo-Saxon*—i. 458; ii. 187. *English*—i. 178; 2 & 3 Edw. VI. c. 19, ii. 425; 5 & 6 Edw. VI. c. 3, i. 144, 171, 178; 5 Eliz. c. 5, ii. 425; 23 Eliz. c. 1, i. 234-5; 1 Cha. I. c. 1, i. 430, 447 *n*, 451, 455, 480; 3 Cha. I. c. 2, i. 430; of the Long Parliament, i. 163, 187, 200, 207, 226, 229, 230, 234, 235, 266, 453; ii. 308; 29 Cha. II. c. 7, ii. 233; 21 Geo. III. c. 49, ii. 234, 313. *Scotch*—James IV., A.D. 1503, i. 359; James VI., A.D. 1579, i. 359. *See* Laws.
Steamboats, ii. 334, 343.
Steane, Edward, ii. 342.
Steffe, John, ii. 207.
Stennet, Edward, i. 267; ii. 10, 60.
Steuchius, Aug., ii. 42.
Steven, William, ii. 448, 459.
Stevens, William B., ii. 417.
Stewart, J. [illegible] 410.
Stillingfleet, Edward, ii. 6, 388; i. 419.
Stockwood, John, i. 133.
Stoddard, Rev. Mr, i. 253.
Stone, John S., ii. 416.
Stooks, T. F., ii. 409.
Stopford, Edward, ii. 340; i. 57, 156, 179, 396; ii. 259, 388.
Stowe, Mrs H. Beecher, ii. 407, 410.
Strangers within the gates, i. 11, 28, 220, 221, 224; ii. 204, 220. *See* Proselytes.
Strangius, ii. 139.
Strauchius, Ægidius, ii. 74.
Streso, Caspar, ii. 139.
Struthers, John, ii. 330.
Stryk, John Samuel, ii. 134.
Strype, John, referred to, i. 139.
Stuart, James, ii. 412.
——— Moses, i. 360-4, 393-4; ii. 336.
Stubbs, Philip, i. 140.
Stukeley, William, ii. 202.
Suetonius, i. 224, 285.
Suicer, John Caspar, ii. 74; i. 403.
Sumner, Charles R., ii. 46.
——— John Bird, ii. 211.
Sun-worship, i. 463; ii. 41, 45, 99.
Sunday, the name, i. 170, 177, 194, 195, 354; ii. 4; used by Justin, i. 323-4, Tertullian, 331, and Constantine, 257, 356; thought by some to have been the primeval Sabbath-day, i. 155, 462, *n*; ii. 40, 86, 92, 101, 168, 175, 203, 207, 244, 339, 366.
Sunday League, National, ii. 313.
Sunday-schools, i. 414; ii. 304.
"Sunday the Rest from Labour," ii. 366, 410, 455.
Supper the chief meal of the Jews, &c., ii. 223. *See* Lord's Supper.
Surgeons, Edinburgh College of, their Sunday meetings, i. 472.
Surinam, ii. 217.
Susa, i. 344.
Swann *v.* Broome, case of, ii. 210.
Swimmers on Sunday said to be frequently drowned, i. 188, 266; ii. 430.
Switzerland, ii. 442, 365.
Sydenham, Crystal Palace at, ii. 239, 313, 343, 359, 360, 363, 376, 377, 396-407.
Symington, Andrew, ii. 342.

Symons, J., ii. 248.
Synagogues, i. 38, 50, 56, 60, 61, 64, 78, 80, 81, 85, 134, 176, 343, 399; ii. 68, 79, 107, 113, 166, 178, 195, 215, 219, 229, 252-3, 275, 305, 319, 364, 386; origin of, i. 294, 295; ii. 19, 107; what meant by, in Acts xv. 21, i. 223; whether anciently places of *worship*, i. 293; ii. 271, 276, 287, 317, 373.
Syrbius, J. J., ii. 172 *n.*

Tables of stone, i. 14, 15, 16, 18, 26, 27, 30, 94, 142; ii. 95, 157, 173.
Tacitus, i. 116.
Talbot, Catherine, ii. 206.
Talmud, i. 223, 478; ii. 20, 164, 175, 172, 221; ii. 221.
Taylor on the Roman Law, i. 305.
——— Charles, ii. 175.
——— Jeremy, ii. 10; quoted, i. 348; ii. 314, 318; referred to, i. 125, 241, 394, 428; ii. 57, 120, 184, 320, 352, 372.
——— John, ii. 208, 348, 349.
——— J. R., ii. 408.
——— Wm. B., ii. 416.
——— W. Cooke, ii. 113.
Tea-gardens, ii. 334.
Teeling, William, ii. 139; i. 218.
Temple, profanation of, ii. 461; feast of dedication of, 84; i. 143.
Temple, Dr, i. 229.
Tertullian, i. 118, 121, 123, 330, 143, 167, 177, 201, 214, 216, 220, 224, 277, 284, 299, 346, 398, 464; ii. 4, 8, 55, 64, 154, 259, 298, 300, 335.
Teutonic race, ii. 365.
Theatres, i. 178, 294, 468, 480; ii. 154, 372, 397, 407.
Theodoret, ii. 4.
Theodosius, Emperor, ii. 55.
Theophilus of Alexandria, i. 123.
——— of Antioch, i. 258, 285.
Theophrastus, i. 74.
Thompson, T. Perronet, ii. 349.
Thomson, Andrew, ii. 184, 341.
——— John, ii. 394.
Thorndike, Herbert, i. 456; referred to, i. 397.
Thoughts, worldly, i. 229, 230, 239.
Thraske. *See* Traske.
Thunberg referred to, i. 114.
Thysius, i. 218.
Tibullus, i. 221, 224, 276, 284 286; ii. 8.
Tillam, Thomas, ii. 58, 447.
Tillotson, Archbishop, ii. 286.
"Time and Faith," ii. 372, 410; referred to, i. 288, 289; ii. 78.
Tindal. *See* Tyndale.
Tithes, i. 477; ii. 97.
Todd, Dr, ii. 375.
Toleration recommended, i. 90, 91; ii. 24, 86, 188, 191.
Tosaphta, ii. 172.
Tostatus, i. 126, 209.
Towerson, Gabriel, ii. 73, 447, 453; i. 398.
Tractarians, i. 311.
Tracts, ii. 347, 417, 418.
Trading on Sunday, i. 469-472; ii. 334, 335, 343, 346.
Tradition, i. 312, 345; ii. 185, 331, 369.
Trajan, Pliny's letter to, i. 118, 295.
Traske, John, i. 152, 300, 431; quoted, 192.
Travelling on the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, i. 435, 468; ii. 26, 160, 207, 221, 244, 323, 333, 337, 339, 340-3, 350-2, 359, 361, 368, 406, 435.
Treffry, Richard, ii. 340.
Trench, Richard, ii. 306.
Trent Catechism, i. 371, 387, 396, 412.
Troas, meeting of disciples at, i. 85; ii. 53, 120, 177, 182, 200, 263, 293, 294, 452-3.
Trollope, William, ii. 57.
Trosse, George, ii. 448.
Trullo, Council of, ii. 153.
Truth always beneficial, ii. 355, 381, 391, 399, 426.
Tudor, Richard, ii, 384, 410.
Turretin, Francis, ii. 81.
T. W., i. 139.
Twells, J., ii. 337.
Twesten, i. 315.
Twisse, William, i. 207; quoted, 179, 216; referred to, 166, 247, 256, 259, 441, 479; ii. 2.
Tyler, J. E., ii. 337.
Tyndale, William, i. 136, 178; quoted, ii. 121, 322.
Types, i. 385; ii. 331 *n.*
Typology of the Sabbath, ii. 346. *See* Sabbath.
Tyrrel, James, i. 263, 461.

UDEMANS, Godfrey, ii. 139; i. 218.
Ugolinus, ii. 172; referred to, i. 157.
Ullman, i. 315.
United Presbyterian Magazine, ii. 352.
United States of America, i. 236, 249, 268, 360, 391; ii. 32, 81, 269, 307, 410-437.
Ursinus, Zacharias, i. 133, 166, 203; ii. 5, 54.
Usher, James, i. 255, 479, 179, 194, 199, 214, 271, 318, 442, 462; ii. 308; answer to, i. 262.
Usury, i. 391.
Utrecht, controversy at, ii. 6.

VALCKENAER, L. C., i. 282.
Variety, need and desire of, ii. 216; i. 242. *See* Recreation.
Vermont, State of, i. 253.
Victorinus, i. 334.
Vigelius, Henry, ii. 139.
Vinton, Alex. H., ii. 417, 433.
Viret, Peter, i. 131, 411.
Virgil quoted, i. 279.
Visiting on Sunday, i. 111; ii. 247.
Vitringa, Campegius, ii. 107, 458; quoted, i. 19; ii. 179; referred to, i. 398; ii. 112, 129, 146, 166, 180, 181, 184, 244, 348.
Voet, Professor, ii. 448.
Voightius, Godfrey, ii. 74.
Volkelius, ii. 93.
Volkhartus, J. G. G., ii. 134.
Voysey, Charles, i. 435-6.

WAITE, J., ii. 73.
Wake, Archbishop, i. 119, 319, 316, 317, 318; ii. 189, 299.
Wakefield, Gilbert, ii. 269, 319, 321; quoted, 299, 317; referred to, 367; i. 318; answers to, ii. 278, 286, 315, 317, 318, 319.
Wakes, i. 447, 451, 453.
Walæus, Antony, i. 157, 218, 441; ii. 306; referred to, i. 209; ii. 29; answer to, i. 240.
Walch, ii. 136.
Waldenses, ii. 419.
Walker, George, i. 207, 476; ii. 38; quoted, 36; answer to, 92; referred to, i. 395.
——— John, ii. 348; referred to, 334; quoted, i. 426.
Walking on the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, i. 111, 186, 204, 205, 241, 252, 457, 468-72; ii. 33, 220, 242, 258, 368, 371, 399 *n*, 402, 403, 408, 453.
Wallace, Alex., i. 437.
Wallis, John, ii. 87, 99; answers to, 91, 173, 174; quoted, 86; i. 283; referred to, ii. 188, 213.
Walmsley, Sir Joshua, ii. 364.
Warburton, Bishop, i. 305.
Wardlaw, Ralph, ii. 337, 338, 341; referred to, 23, 98, 259, 334; quoted, i. 390; ii. 174, 294.
Warren, Edmund, ii. 140; i. 476; ii. 6, 459.
Water, carrying of, i. 472.
Waterbury, J. B., ii. 415.
Watson, Bishop, ii. 162, 286.
Watts, Isaac, ii. 187; i. 318, 394; answer to, ii. 198.
Wauchope, John, ii. 354.
Weariness caused by the puritanical observance of the Lord's-day, i. 172, 184, 242, 414, 434; ii. 13, 15, 25, 76, 130, 147, 207, 217, 325, 344.
Weather in Palestine, i. 407; ii. 223.
Webster, William, ii. 206.
Wednesday, i. 333, 339, 340, 345.
Week, i. 5, 176, 274, 278, 285, 287; ii. 128, 175, 195, 258, 363, 373, 390, 395, 441; origin of, i. 189, 278, 288, 289, 290; ii. 88, 100, 103, 356, 358; when first used by the Romans, i. 324-5; abolished by the French Revolutionists, ii. 322; restored by Napoleon I., *ib.*; names of the days of the, i. 225, 324-5; ii. 42.
Weir, John, ii. 343.
Weiser, R., ii. 416.
Wells, John, ii. 13.
——— Lucy K., ii. 416.
Wemyss, Thomas, ii. 330.
Wesley, John, ii. 286.
West, Francis, ii. 329.
Westcott, B. F., i. 283.
Westminster Assembly, i. 200, 214, 226, 228, 247, 271; Confession of, i. 228, 235, 236, 269, 306, 351, 391, 395, 419; ii. 452, 462; members of, i. 161, 193, 207, 213, 226, 238, 265, 271; ii. 19, 87; Larger Catechism, i. 231, 200, 230, 235, 260; ii. 175, 380; Directory, i. 230; Shorter Catechism, i. 232, 156, 197, 214, 231, 351, 391, 395, 420, 466; ii. 45, 81, 87, 118,

128, 152, 243, 312, 380, 381, 452, 464.
Westminster Review, i. 114; ii. 359, 360, 363, 367, 374; quoted, i. 413; referred to, 431, 437.
Wetstein, John James, ii. 375.
"What is Sabbath-breaking?" pamphlet on that question, i. 397, 398, 428, 432, 458; ii. 453.
Whately, Richard, ii. 333, 363; quoted, i. 395; ii. 144; referred to, i. 394; ii. 184, 300, 368, 372; answers to, ii. 334, 336, 338, 339, 348.
Whewell, William, i. 325.
Whipple, Charles K., ii. 417.
Whiston, William, i. 292; ii. 229.
Whitby, Daniel, i. 100; ii. 297, 317.
White, Bishop Francis, i. 166, 188; quoted, ii. 432; referred to, i. 163, 173, 186, 189, 195, 197, 206, 247, 270, 398, 451, 455; ii. 2, 29, 129; answers to, i. 194, 200, 240, 265; ii. 29.
——— Bishop William, of Pennsylvania, ii. 414.
Whitelock, Bulstrode, quoted, i. 226.
Whitgift, Archbishop, i. 147.
Widley, George, i. 415.
Wight, George, i. 438.
Wilberforce, William, ii. 314, 323.
Wilkins, David, ii. 187; i. 458.
Wilkinson, Henry, i. 265, 229.
Willet referred to, i. 203.
Williams, John, i. 264, 480.
——— W. M., referred to, ii. 365.
Willison, John, ii. 158, 460; i. 318.
Wilson, Daniel, ii. 335, 414; referred to, i. 286, 311, 327, 419; ii. 323.
——— *James, ii. 317, 321.*
——— *John, i. 480.*
——— *Joseph, ii. 337.*
——— *William Carus, ii. 339.*
Winer, G. B., ii. 438.
Winthrop, Governor, i. 251, 253.
Witsius, Herman, ii. 92; i. 395, 403.
Wittewrongel, Peter, ii. 139.
Wodrow, Robert, i. 254; ii. 448.
Wolf, Abraham, ii. 433.
Wood, Anthony, quoted, i. 187, 460; referred to, 161, 192.
Woodman, Mr, ii. 379.
Woods, L., ii. 335.
Woodward, Josiah, ii. 125.
Woolwich Lectures, ii. 343.
Worcester, Henry A., ii. 415.
Wordsworth, Christopher, i. 287-288 *n.*
Worgan, J. H., i. 439.
Work, what meant by, in the Fourth Commandment, i. 416; ii. 2 *n*, 221, 443-6; whether enjoined on six days, i. 204, 379, 411; ii. 75, 84, 126; whether in itself sinful on the Lord's-day—*see* Rest.
Working-men, Essays by, ii. 341.
Worship, ii. 1; Christian, i. 111; ii. 70, 195; cannot be continued by all for a whole day, i. 172, 183-4, 216, 242, 414, 434; ii. 15, 25, 33, 76, 130, 147-52, 197, 207, 217, 307, 312, 325, 344—*see* Recreation; of Old and New Testaments contrasted, ii. 137; whether any kind of, except resting, is enjoined by the Fourth Commandment—*see* Rest; bad effects ascribed to ceremonial, ii. 276; coldness in, 147, 321, 344.
Worship, public, i. 110, 230, 231, 233, 408, 420; ii. 26, 48, 52, 231, 321, 330, 358, 366, 367, 370; controversy on its expediency and propriety, ii. 270-291, 315-320.
Wotton, William, ii. 165, 453; i. 398.
Wren, Bishop, i. 448.
Wright, H. C., ii. 351, 424.
——— Samuel, ii. 167, 172, 432; answer to, 185, 186, 187.
Wrixon, John, ii. 346.
Wroughton, Charles, ii. 162.
Wyman, Rufus, ii. 411.

YOUNG, F. R., ii. 378, 410.
——— Thomas, i. 193, 475, 245, 247, 265, 350; ii. 29, 38, 260, 459.

ZANCHIUS, Hieronymus, i. 135, 150, 180, 201, 203, 394, 400; ii. 93.
Zoological Gardens, ii. 337, 397.
Zuinglius, Ulricus, i. 131, 203, 386, 441.
Züllig, ii. 375.

PRINTED BY NEILL AND COMPANY, EDINBURGH.

ERRATA IN VOLUME II.

Page 3, line 3, *for* Es. *read* Ex.
Page 18, line 2 from bottom, *after* pro *insert* Doctrinâ de.
Page 19, lines 1 and 2, *for* Pontificios quosdam, Lutheranos *read* Pontificios, quosdam Lutheranos.
Page 23, lines 12 and 13 from bottom, *read* the spiritual repose of the saints here and in heaven.
Page 26, line 34, *for* Authemius *read* Anthemius.
Page 31, line 18, *for* xxi. *read* xx.
Page 64, line 8 from bottom, *delete* *.
Page 74, line 16, *after* Philol. *insert* Amst. 1701, fol.
Page 79, line 10 from bottom, *for* Lev. *read* Numb.
Page 79, line 7 from bottom, *before* xxviii. *insert* Numb.
Page 107, line 11, *for* Synagogorum *read* Synagogarum.
Page 114, line 33, *for* Acts v. *read* Acts xv.
Page 167, article 233, *for* The Seventh-Day Man in his Vanity, &c. *read* The Seventh-Day Man, or Restless Christian, in the vanity of his Jewish Sabbath, and presumptuous contempt of Gospel Rest, offered to consideration; and the Lord's Day justified as the true Christian Sabbath, visible in and to be rested on according to, the Fourth Commandment. Lond., N.D. 8vo, pp. 36.
Page 172, lines 4 and 5 from bottom, *for* Josaphta *read* Tosaphta.
Page 179, line 15 from bottom, *for* ingratiam *read* in gratiam.
Page 185, line 14, *for* Nine *read* Sixteen.
Page 307, line 5 from bottom, *for* high! *read* high;
Page 315, line 2 from bottom, *for* some years ago *read* in 1857.
Page 388, line 8, *delete* White.

00111643

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 19 September, 2016